

Memory in Shakespeare's Second Tetralogy

Rebecca Warren-Heys

Royal Holloway, University of London

Submission for Doctor of Philosophy

DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

I hereby declare that this thesis and the work presented in it is my own. Where I have consulted the work of others, this is clearly stated.

Rebecca Warren-Heys, October 2013.

THESIS ABSTRACT

This thesis undertakes an original analysis of the incidence and influence of memory in Shakespeare's second tetralogy. It is the first full-length study of memory in Shakespeare to show not only how memories can lock characters into history but also how memories can be released from history in order to engender radically different futures. This thesis offers detailed close readings of key scenes in the second tetralogy to substantiate this argument and to illuminate afresh issues at the heart of the plays, such as identity, time and death. It builds on previous and current research on memory in Shakespeare, as well as considering how he may have engaged with original archival sources such as Petrus's 'Art of Memory' and Gratarolo's 'Castle of Memory'.

The first chapter of this thesis provides an overview of Shakespeare's use of and reliance on memory in the canon, supplies a review of previous works on memory, and explains the scope and structure of the thesis. The second chapter defines terms and clarifies the method of the thesis, considers the phenomenology of memory, and elucidates the crucial concept of forward recollection. The third chapter explores how and why Shakespeare's drama is an especially apt vehicle for memory. These three chapters prepare the ground for the subsequent four chapters, which examine each of the plays in the second tetralogy in turn. The chapters on the plays focus on key aspects of memory that exemplify the wider argument of the thesis: memory and identity in *Richard II*; memory and time in *1 Henry IV*; memory and death in *2 Henry IV*; and memory and forward recollection in *Henry V*.

CONTENTS

Declaration of Authorship	2
Thesis Abstract	3
Acknowledgments	5
A Note on Texts	6
Chapter One: Introduction	7
The Faculty of Memory in the Works of Shakespeare	7
Previous Studies of Memory in Shakespeare and Early Modern Literature.....	14
Structure, Scope and Aims of Thesis.....	28
Chapter Two: Definitions and Phenomenology of Memory.....	32
Taxonomy.....	32
The Phenomenology of Memory	43
The Direction of Memory.....	52
Chapter Three: A Drama and a Language of Memory.....	60
Memory in Drama	60
Shakespeare the Historian	78
How does the Language of the Plays Disclose Memories?.....	80
Chapter Four: Memory and Identity in <i>Richard II</i>.....	83
Remembering Richard.....	83
Richard Remembering.....	90
Memories of Times to Come.....	102
Conclusion	106
Chapter Five: Memory and Time in <i>1 Henry IV</i>.....	109
Hal: 'Redeeming time' (1.2.185-207).....	111
Hotspur: 'If life did ride upon a dial's point' (5.2.83).....	120
Falstaff: 'What a devil hast thou to do with the time of day?' (1.2.5-6)	127
Conclusion	133
Chapter Six: Memory and Death in <i>2 Henry IV</i>.....	136
The Rebels: 'a bleeding land, Gasping for life'	139
Shallow: 'all shall die'	144
Henry IV: 'waste the memories of the former days'	152
Conclusion	159
Chapter Seven: Memory and Forward Recollection in <i>Henry V</i>	161
The Chorus	163
Henry	172
Conclusion	180
Chapter Eight: Conclusion: Memory in the Second Tetralogy	183
Bibliography	188
Primary Sources	188
Secondary Sources	189
Websites.....	201
Appendix A: The Memory Theatre of Giulio Camillo	202

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the generous grant from the Arts and Humanities Research Council which made this study possible. The English Department at Royal Holloway, both academics and the wonderful administrative staff, fostered a rich research culture and a warm environment in which to work. I want also to acknowledge my fellow Shakespearean doctoral students, Theodora Papadopoulou, Will McKenzie, Charlotte Keys, Paul Hamilton, Mohamed Salim-Said, and Helen True: you were inspiring friends and colleagues, with whom it was a pleasure to share ideas. Thanks are due to Daniel O’Gorman, Alexander Rain, Anna Markowska of Surrey University and Pete Kirwan of Warwick University, all of whom answered queries on subjects which were not my speciality. Deanna Fernie’s and John Miles’s superlative academic writing courses were invaluable. Deana Rankin fulfilled her advisory role with an unrivalled dedication for which I am enormously grateful.

To my doctoral supervisors, Ewan Fernie and Kiernan Ryan, I owe an enormous debt. I am fortunate to have had not one but two such accomplished Shakespeareans as my supervisors, and I am certain that I would never have reached this stage without them. My wonderful parents, Nick and Jaga Heys, asked thoughtful questions and expressed interest throughout the long process of completing this thesis. The babysitting lovingly provided by them and my parents-in-law, David and Mary Warren, made it possible for me to attend numerous conferences and courses. My husband John listened patiently while an idea overtook me or while I worked through it out loud. My daughters, Emily and Laura, were unfailingly patient and made my work so much easier. It is to them that this thesis is dedicated: if something is important to you, I hope you find a way to do it, too.

A NOTE ON TEXTS

Unless otherwise specified, all references to the plays of Shakespeare's second tetralogy are to the most recent Arden Shakespeare editions: *Richard II*, ed. Charles R. Forker, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2005); *Henry IV Part One*, ed. David Scott Kastan, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2002); *Henry IV Part Two*, ed. A. R. Humphreys, Arden second series (London: Thomson Learning, 2003); and *Henry V*, ed. T. W. Craik, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2005).

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION

The Faculty of Memory in the Works of Shakespeare

References to both the faculty of memory and memories themselves abound in Shakespeare's plays and poems. There are 59 instances of the word 'memory' or 'memories' in 25 of the plays, while 'remember' and 'forget' occur 184 and 86 times respectively.¹ Memory is of crucial importance to some of Shakespeare's greatest tragedies. As he recalls how his mother doted on his father, Hamlet laments, 'Must I remember?' (1.2.143);² the ghost of his father implores him not only to revenge but above all to 'Remember' (1.5.91); and the play concludes with Fortinbras reclaiming his 'rights of memory in this kingdom' (5.2.368). Othello is haunted by the recollection of Desdemona's handkerchief passing through Cassio's hands. 'By heaven,' he exclaims:

I would most gladly have forgot it!
Thou said'st – O, it comes o'er my memory,
As doth the raven o'er the infectious house,
Boding to all - he had my handkerchief.
(4.1.19-22)³

Likewise, Macbeth and Lady Macbeth are both disturbed by the memory of their crimes, but Lady Macbeth suffers 'thick coming fancies | That keep her from her rest.'⁴ Macbeth demands of the doctor:

Cure her of that:
Canst thou not minister to a mind diseas'd,
Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,

¹ For this and subsequent statistics regarding frequency of usage in the plays, I have used the concordance available at <http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/concordance/> [Last accessed 30.07.2013].

² William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. Harold Jenkins, Arden second series (London: Thomson Learning, 2000). Subsequent references are to this edition.

³ William Shakespeare, *Othello*, ed. E. A. J. Honigmann, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2001).

⁴ William Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, ed. Kenneth Muir, Arden second series (London: Thomson Learning, 2001). Subsequent references are to this edition.

Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
And with some sweet oblivious antidote
Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart?

(5.3.39-44)

In her discussion with the Nurse in Act 3, Juliet feels the same effects as Lady Macbeth, without having committed a crime at all. She reflects on Tybalt's death and Romeo's banishment, and 'would forget it fain':

But, O, it presses to my memory
Like damnèd guilty deeds to sinners' minds!
'Tybalt is dead, and Romeo—banishèd'

(3.2.109-12)⁵

Hamlet, Othello, Lady Macbeth, and Juliet would all rather forget, in stark contrast to King Lear, whose comfort depends on his daughters *remembering* his gifts to them and his remaining rights: 'Thy half o' the kingdom hast thou not forgot, | Wherein I thee endow'd', he says hopefully to Regan (2.2.368-9).⁶

Memory proves pivotal in the Romances too. In *The Tempest*, Prospero asks Miranda what her 'remembrance' discerns in 'the dark backward and abysm of time' (1.2.46, 50),⁷ and Ariel's 'business' with Alonso, Sebastian and Co. is to remind them of their past misdeeds (3.3.68-9). In the same play, Gonzalo's noble dream of a utopia is punctured by Sebastian's and Antonio's observation in a cynical aside that 'the latter end of his commonwealth forgets the beginning', in as much as Gonzalo 'would be king on't' (2.1.155, 154). Sebastian and Antonio sneer that he is a 'lord of weak remembrance' (l. 230), but in this case Gonzalo remembers all too well the hierarchical basis of the world he has left and he replicates it unconsciously in his utopian fantasy. In *The Winter's Tale*, Leontes builds a monument to his wife so that he will hold her forever in his memory and never be allowed to forget his crimes against her, constant reminders of which he can count on receiving from the 'Good Paulina, | Who hast the memory of Hermione, | I know, in honour' (5.1.49-51).⁸ In *Pericles* the protagonist complains to the fishermen who find him cast upon their coast, 'What I have been, I

⁵ William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. T. J. B. Spencer (London: Penguin, 2005).

⁶ William Shakespeare, *King Lear*, ed. R. A. Foakes, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2003).

⁷ William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 1999). Subsequent references are to this edition.

⁸ William Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale*, ed. Stephen Orgel (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

have forgot to know' (2.1.70).⁹ Clearly, his inability to recall his former life has a profound impact on his identity. His wife, Thaisa, wakes from her death-like sleep to a completely new life, a life made sense of by what she can remember on the one hand, and what she cannot be sure of on the other:

[. . .] That I was shipped at sea
I well remember, even on my groaning time,
But whether there delivered, by the holy gods
I cannot rightly say.

(3.4.4-7)

Forgetting her origins and the tail-end of her story grants Thaisa a new life, but it also destroys her old one, thereby revealing the double-edged nature of her amnesia.

In the comedies the audience repeatedly see memories highlighting the plays' key preoccupations. In *The Comedy of Errors*, for example, the farcical humour arises chiefly from the fact that characters believe they remember having spoken to Antipholus or Dromio of Ephesus, when in fact they have spoken to Antipholus or Dromio of Syracuse, or vice versa:

EGEON I am sure you both of you remember me.
DROMIO E. Ourselves we remember sir, by you,
 For lately we were bound as you are now.
 You are not Pinch's patient, are you, sir?
EGEON Why look you strange on me? You know me well.

(5.1.292-6)¹⁰

Memories, in this instance, cannot be relied upon, yet the incredible situations the characters find themselves in show that they also automatically construct relationships and identities. In *As You Like It*, Orlando uses the language of memory to explain the source of his distress in the first line of the play: 'As I remember, Adam,' he complains, 'it was upon this fashion bequeathed me by will but poor a thousand crowns [. . .] and there begins my sadness' (1.1.1-2, 4).¹¹ For Rosalind, the main romantic action of the play rides on the premise of a life lived in the fleeting freedom of forgotten gender as Ganymede. The title of *As You like It* suggests the audience's involvement with and

⁹ William Shakespeare and George Wilkins, *Pericles*, ed. Suzanne Gossett, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2005).

¹⁰ William Shakespeare, *The Comedy of Errors*, ed. T. S. Dorsch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

¹¹ William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Alan Brissenden (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998). Subsequent references are to this edition.

support of this suspension of normality, although the exiled court in Arden is plainly denied the privilege the cross-dressing Rosalind enjoys, for they remember the reality and roles they left behind, and maintain the established social order even in the licensed natural realm. Thus the Duke is pleased at the close of the play to be given news of the restoration of his dukedom, which allows him to 'share the good of our returned fortune | According to the measure of their states' (5.4.169-70). In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, on the other hand, for one wondrous night both Bottom and Titania are charmed into forgetting his lowly status. He is 'translated' (3.1.113-4)¹² into something 'wise' and 'beautiful', a 'gentleman' (3.1.142, 157). As in *The Comedy of Errors* and *As You Like It*, memory reveals itself to be inextricably bound up with the retention of identities and relationships, and their erasure with their temporary suspension or transmutation, which is subsequently remembered and puzzled over by Bottom: 'I have had a most rare vision. I have had a dream past the wit of man to say what dream it was. Man is but an ass if he go about to expound this dream' (4.1.203-6).

In the problem plays, memory or the lack of it also has a key part to play in characters' motivations and actions. In *Measure for Measure*, one of the arguments Vincentio puts to Claudio to persuade him to 'be absolute for death' is that:

Happy thou art not;
For what thou hast not, still thou striv'st to get,
And what thou hast, forget'st.
(3.1.21-3)¹³

This is a speech which could have come from the mouth of Barnardine, who is 'fearless of what's past, present, or to come' (4.2.141-2), and who undermines the authority of the state by being genuinely indifferent to his fate. Barnardine refuses to exercise his memory of his homicidal crimes in the past and consequently feels neither remorse for them in the present, nor dread of his execution in the future, thereby highlighting the indispensability of memory to the effective administration of the law. At the close of *All's Well That Ends Well*, the King almost replicates the disastrous marriage of Bertram and Helen by giving his royal blessing to the marriage of Bertram and Maudlin. This

¹² William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. Harold Brooks, Arden second series (London: Thomson Learning, 2000). Subsequent references are to this edition.

¹³ William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, ed. J. W. Lever, Arden second series (London: Thomson Learning, 2004).

happens because he first decides officially to forget Bertram's misdemeanours - 'the nature of his great offence is dead, | And deeper than oblivion we do bury [it]' (5.3.23-5)¹⁴ - and then just as summarily instructs Bertram to wipe Helen from his mind: 'and now forget her. | Send forth your amorous token for fair Maudlin' (5.3.66-7). So hasty is the King to patch up the past by expunging Helen and Bertram's betrayal of her from memory that he repeats his perilous match-making mistakes. Astonishingly, after the prospect of Bertram's and Maudlin's betrothal has been dashed by Helen's resurrection, the King offers to arrange yet another impromptu marriage, as if he cannot remember the failure of his previous attempts at match-making. 'If thou be'st yet a fresh uncroppèd flower,' he says to Diana, 'Choose thou thy husband and I'll pay thy dower' (5.3.327-8). In *Troilus and Cressida* the lovers' fate is sealed at their vow-taking in a scene which can be interpreted as a betrothal, when Cressida invokes memory to be her witness: 'let memory, | From false to false, among false maids in love | Upbraid my falsehood!' (3.2.184-6).¹⁵ *Troilus and Cressida*, being based on legends already familiar to many in the Elizabethan audiences from Homer and Chaucer, resembles the history plays in that it tells a story whose basic course and conclusion the audience may already know. The audience's memory, and thus foreknowledge, of the subsequent events of the play lend the lovers' pledge of eternal fidelity a poignant irony of which they are oblivious.

And what of the history plays? Despite their being concerned by definition with the dramatised recollection of the nation's past, critics examining the role of memory in Shakespeare have turned elsewhere more often than not for their evidence and examples.¹⁶ But the history plays have something arresting to say about memories, which is both incidental and instrumental to the action. Consider, for example, this speech from *2 Henry IV*:

The Prince will, in the perfectness of time,
Cast off his followers, and their memory
Shall as a pattern or a measure live

¹⁴ William Shakespeare, *All's Well that Ends Well*, ed. Susan Snyder (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

¹⁵ William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, ed. David Bevington, Arden third series (Thomson Learning: London, 2004).

¹⁶ See for instance Stephen Greenblatt's chapter, 'Remember Me', in *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001), pp. 205-57. A. S. Byatt's and Harriet Harvey Wood's *Memory: An Anthology* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2008) quotes Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* (pp. 25-6), *The Tempest* (p. 121), and *King Lear* (p. 391).

By which his Grace must mete the lives of others,
Turning past evils to advantages

(4.4.74-78).

Warwick speaks here of Hal's memory of his followers' misconduct not only providing 'a pattern or a measure' for the future, but also affecting it in a beneficial way, allowing Hal to learn from their mistakes and miraculously turn 'past evils to advantages'. Hal could choose to use such patterns and measures exclusively to his own advantage, but that does not preclude his remembrance of events past proving a positive advantage to 'the lives of others' as well once he becomes their ruler. Warwick flags up a key concern of this thesis: how important memory is for shaping life in the *future*; in contrast to this, King Richard II becomes acutely conscious of memory's power to shape the *present*, as he yearns in vain to erase his memory:

Oh that I could forget what I have been,
Or not remember what I must be now!

(*Richard II*, 3.3.138-9)

Richard demonstrates here another of the key concerns of this thesis: how much the identity of the characters in the second tetralogy is determined by memory. Richard's anguish would be extinguished if he could only forget his once royal state, reduced as he is now to a prisoner in a castle. Later in the tetralogy the Archbishop of York predicts that Henry IV will take pains to forget completely the misdeeds of the rebels:

[. . .] therefore will he wipe his tables clean
And keep no tell-tale to his memory
That may repeat and history his loss
To new remembrance.

(*2 Henry IV*, 4.1.201-4)

York implies that 'memory' can create 'history', and thus that erasing 'memory' prevents the preservation of that 'history' by 'new remembrance'. But the tetralogy demonstrates how intractable memories can be; as the newly proclaimed Henry V indignantly demands of the Lord Chief Justice:

How might a prince of my great hopes forget
So great indignities you laid upon me? [. . .]

May this be wash'd in Lethe, and forgotten?

(2 *Henry IV*, 5.2.68-9, 72)

The history plays are a particularly rewarding source of insights into the vital roles and complex significance of memory in Shakespeare's drama. The roles of memory include creating identities for the characters in the plays, commenting on key issues such as time and death, and voicing, through the characters, diverse reflections on the period of history they cover. The significance of memories in the history plays is revealed by a consideration of these roles and of the ethical and political consequences of remembering, remembering awry, and forgetting which the plays explore.

In this thesis I propose to focus on memory in the English history plays, and on the second tetralogy in particular: *Richard II*, 1 and 2 *Henry IV*, and *Henry V*. There has been some debate in recent years about how 'English' the English history plays really are,¹⁷ and how much they deserve to be dubbed 'History' plays.¹⁸ Although I recognise the value of this debate, my own view is that, however complex the geopolitical scope and generic identity of his English history plays may be, Shakespeare used them above all to build – with and for his audience – multiple memories of the period of history that forged their Elizabethan world – memories that remain vividly alive in our own world today.

Not only the choice of events, characters, and words, but also the *form* of Shakespeare's history plays reveal works which are embroiled in a fight to be remembered, labouring to create and complicate, through art, memories in the minds of characters and audiences then and now. The extent to which the stock-in-trade of Shakespeare's art, such as iambic pentameter, rhyme, the alternation of verse and prose, and dramatic structure, collude with the act of remembering has yet to be fully appreciated and to receive the attention it merits. Through sustained close readings of key moments in the plays of the second tetralogy, I hope to go some way towards correcting that neglect. There is a distinction between an 'art of *memory*', which sees

¹⁷ See, for example, Michael Neill, *Putting History into the Question: Power, Politics, and Society in English Renaissance Drama* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000); Andrew Murphy, 'Shakespeare's Irish History', *Literature and History*, 3rd series, 5 (1996), 38-59; and Christopher Highley, *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). All three studies contend in one way or another that the 'English' history plays are not quite as 'English' as they might first appear.

¹⁸ See, for example, Paulina Kewes, 'The Elizabethan History Play: A True Genre?', in *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works Vol. II: The Histories*, ed. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 170-93.

the plays as 'about' memory, and an 'art of memory', which sees the *form* of the plays as creating and complicating memories of places and people and times. Thus audiences' and characters' memories can shape the history plays, but, conversely, the history plays' *art* of memory also allows them to construct and manipulate audiences' and characters' memories. The difference between the art of *memory* and the *art* of memory is crucial, because my argument is that this form of art, exemplified *par excellence* by Shakespeare in the history plays, works to generate, mobilise and explore memories. My focus on *how* Shakespeare's use of language in these plays produces problematised memories, and the close readings I undertake to demonstrate this, are features of this study that mark it out as different from the studies of memory in Shakespeare and early modern literature that have preceded it.

Previous Studies of Memory in Shakespeare and Early Modern Literature

There are a number of studies which deal with memory in the Renaissance and in Shakespeare in particular, and I want to review the most pertinent of them here in order to situate this thesis in relation to them. I will consider them in four sections: the first considers studies which can be credited with beginning academics' interest in cultural and literary memory; the second will assess studies which broadly share my concern with the conception of memory in Shakespeare; the third will survey studies which share my concern with memory specifically in the histories; and the fourth will consider studies which deal with prediction or anticipation in Shakespeare.

The first two books that must be mentioned are of immense importance in the field of memory studies. They have been the catalyst for a number of other studies more closely focused on Shakespeare. The first is Frances Yates's seminal work, *The Art of Memory*.¹⁹ First published in 1966, it quickly acquired the status of a classic. It showed how people in Western Europe before the invention of printing - particularly scholars and members of religious communities - sought to memorize vast amounts of knowledge without the aid of printed books. Starting with the invention of the art of memory by the Greeks and tracing its transformations through the Middle Ages, Yates ended her study with an extended consideration of the weird and occult forms the art took in the Renaissance. Following on from Yates, Mary Carruthers produced another

¹⁹ Frances A. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Pimlico, 1992).

landmark study, *The Book of Memory* (1990),²⁰ which was devoted to the way memory was trained in literature, music, architecture, and (again) used in religious communities in the Middle Ages. To read Shakespeare's plays in the light of Yates and Carruthers is to be struck by how distinctive their depiction of memory is. Indeed, Lina Perkins Wilder, whose study I review below, has applied the Renaissance concept of the art of memory as explained by Yates to a number of Shakespeare's plays. However, where I differ from Yates and Carruthers is not least in offering an alternative understanding of the term 'art of memory', which I explain more fully in Chapter 3. Although both these studies are invaluable for understanding the development of the art of memory from ancient times until the early modern era, what neither of them can account for is the quite different conception of how memories work that emerges in the drama of Shakespeare. Indeed, the plays' involvement with memory can be understood, I would contend, *without* referring to the notion of the House of Memory that circulated during the Renaissance.

Scholars subsequent to Yates and Carruthers brought these trailblazing studies to bear on the literature of the early modern era and on Shakespeare in particular, and thus the second group of studies I wish to survey are those which broadly share my concern with the conception of memory in Shakespeare. William Engel's *Death and Drama in Renaissance England: Shades of Memory* finds the application of the classical 'art of memory' in a variety of texts, not only in plays such as *The Revenger's Tragedy* and *The White Devil*, but also in dictionaries such as John Florio's foreign-language phrase-books and proverbs, and chronicles such as Sir Walter Raleigh's *History of the World*. As his title suggests, Engel's account of memory in Shakespeare focuses on death in the tragedies. Writing principally about *Macbeth* and *Hamlet*, although with passing reference to other tragedies including *Julius Caesar*, Engel sees the pageant of kings in *Macbeth* and the dumb show in *Hamlet* as 'mnemonic in form, content, and character'.²¹ He rightly sees the pageant of kings as a 'pageant of history', since the kings are in *Macbeth*'s future, but in the Jacobean audience's past and present. Ultimately, he sees such mnemonic displays as a kind of 'social or shared memory', a

²⁰ Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

²¹ William E. Engel, *Death and Drama in Renaissance England: Shades of Memory* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 38.

symbol in the collective mind of a given community or culture.²² For Engel, incidents in the texts such as the pageant of kings are metaphors or symbols, which are embedded in the texts but visible to and decipherable by readers. He calls this 'encoded mnemonics'.²³ He argues that 'encoded mnemonics' determines how readers interpret the text, and come to see both themselves in relation to it and themselves in relation to the wider world; the text defines the reader. But I would argue that the memories coursing through these Shakespearean texts present the reader with a plurality of possible worlds and places within it, rather than a single determinate standpoint or perspective. For Engel, memory keeps oblivion at bay in Shakespeare; for me, it brings forward the future. This is because I differ from Engel in my view of the kind of memories the plays are producing, and the kind of effect they have on their audience.

In 2004 Christopher Ivic and Grant Williams edited *Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and Culture: Lethe's Legacies*, a collection of essays on English Renaissance literary texts.²⁴ As they explain in their introduction, the aim of the volume is to shift the focus from the 'art of memory' to the converse phenomenon of forgetting. The book is divided into four sections, which deal with forgetting in the body as a site of memory; poetical and rhetorical 'signs' of forgetting; forgetting as a means to formulate or reformulate identity; and forgetting in the early modern theatre and library. The volume includes two essays on Shakespeare: one on *1 Henry IV*, and one on *A Midsummer's Night Dream*. I am indebted to Ivic's essay, 'Reassuring Fratricide in *1 Henry IV*' which contests early new historicist readings of Shakespeare's history plays as propping up the official historiographical line on the era, 'and instead recognises the ways in which they actively participated in the production of early modern history and culture'.²⁵ Ivic concludes his essay thus:

What I have been tracing in *1 Henry IV*, then, is less an example of Shakespeare's commitment to the Tudor myth and more of an instance of Shakespeare appropriating the narrative material that sustained royalist propaganda for the purposes of rewriting narratives of the nation.²⁶

²² *Ibid.*, p. 39.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

²⁴ Christopher Ivic and Grant Williams (eds), *Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and Culture: Lethe's Legacies* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

'Tudor myth' and 'royalist propaganda' can be understood as forms of collective memory, and Ivic is clear that Shakespeare did not adhere to it. This view of *1 Henry IV* lies at the heart of my own attempt in this thesis to show that the memories Shakespeare creates in these history plays can be intensely personal and individual, and not merely a theatrical means of promoting a collective memory.

In 2005 Garret A. Sullivan published *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster*.²⁷ Sullivan's real concern seems to be how his three playwrights see the forgetting of the self as an opportunity for a reconfiguration of subjectivity. This is an intriguing argument, but it tends to neglect or take for granted how memories might formulate identity in the first place, something which is a fundamental concern of this thesis. Sullivan's key premise is that memories lock us into a specific identity (what others in society perceive us to be), whereas forgetting that identity creates our subjectivity (which is what we perceive ourselves to be). He contends that it is the disjunction between these two perceptions - society's and their own - that creates a character's sense of loss or non-belonging.²⁸ But here my thinking differs significantly from Sullivan's, because I see memory as a unique and potentially liberating force for characters which can be intensely personal and individual. To see remembering as a societal or cultural imposition of personality or identity closes down the possibility of possessing a private memory, which can be radically at odds with history as written or as understood by other characters even in the same play. Characters' personal memories, imagined and put into words by Shakespeare, are sometimes the only way they can reach for or gesture towards a desired future, even if it is beyond their grasp.

In 2006 Peter Holland edited a collection of essays entitled *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*. By looking at the editorial process, the way actors memorize their lines, the memories inherent in costume and props,²⁹ and the way in which we archive performances of Shakespeare on tape and film, these essays show how memory is fundamentally related to every aspect of performance. Taken together, they make a case for a cultural memory of the plays of Shakespeare which

²⁷ Garrett A. Sullivan, *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 134ff.

²⁹ Ann Jones and Peter Stallybrass explore the connotations of costumes in depth in *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

'acknowledge, fashion and perform [. . .] the creation of our selves'.³⁰ Although a number of the essays mention in passing a play or plays of the second tetralogy, John J. Joughin's essay, 'Shakespeare's Memorial Aesthetics', which reflects on Shakespeare's 'mourning plays',³¹ *Hamlet* and *Richard II*, has the most direct bearing on my own study. By 'memorial aesthetics' Joughin means the concentration of new historicist and cultural materialist criticism on death, pain and suffering in these plays, and that criticism's meditation on representations of the body. He regards the absorption of historicist and materialist critics in such things as problematic, because it makes it difficult for them to reconcile history with tragedy: 'How are we to eventually come to terms with, or remember, the forgotten dead if their history is fated only to be construed as the figure of and for inconsolable loss?'³² In other words, by highlighting how the remembered dead of the plays create tragedy, criticism of this kind ignores or forgets the fact that the remembered dead can equally create history. This question highlights the difficulty of defining the plays' generic identity, because, as Joughin shows, if the 'forgotten dead' of *Hamlet* and *Richard II* are remembered only as part of a tragedy, as figures 'of and for inconsolable loss', it is harder to examine the plays from an historical perspective, which diminishes the richness of a given play's potential generic origins and intentions. Joughin's ultimate aim is to make the case for 'a new aestheticism', which would offer 'a political repositioning of viewer and victim in relation to these [. . .] rituals of national mourning without merely sentimentalising them.'³³ My thesis departs from Joughin's work, inasmuch as it thinks about the dead of the second tetralogy specifically in relation to memory as opposed to generic considerations.

Lina Perkins Wilder's *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre*, which I mentioned above, focuses on the physical aspects of the Renaissance theatre, such as props and places as mnemonic objects, and develops a feminist reading of women and clowns as the sites of physical memory. Using a combination of 'materialist, historicist, and cognitive'³⁴ approaches, Wilder looks at the role of our cultural recollection of the

³⁰ Peter Holland (ed.), *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 349.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 53.

³³ Holland, *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*, p. 62.

³⁴ Lina Perkins Wilder, *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. i.

plays in understanding the theatre of Shakespeare's age. Chapter 3, entitled 'Wasting Memory: Competing Mnemonics in the Henry plays', analyses specific instances of remembering and forgetting which I also consider, such as the play within the play (*1 Henry IV*, 2.4). She writes about how Shakespeare creates history through memory: 'In the history plays, the *invention* of history (a cognitive process closely associated with remembering) comes to the fore'.³⁵ But she does so without recognising that 'inventing' history is not only 'a cognitive process' but also a somatic process, which takes place in the writing and performance of the plays before it takes place in the audience's memory. Wilder has also shown that the plays can be understood with reference to the *artes memorativae* first discussed by Yates, and that the memory theatre of Fludd and Willis can have an exploratory function in Shakespeare's theatre. But my interest in this study is in how memory works in ways other than the architectural 'Art of Memory' as understood by Yates and Carruthers. I am especially interested in showing through close readings, and for the first time, how memories are created in the plays through language, rhetoric and syntax. In this respect my thesis proceeds on the assumption that, to quote Jonas Barish:

Shakespeare shows no interest in pigeon-holing [memory] or classifying it as a separable psychological datum, nor does he show any curiosity about the so-called *artes memorativae*, that weird melange of mnemotechnics and occultism that dazzles so many Renaissance philosophers and scientists. He is, however, keenly interested in the dynamics of memory, in how it weaves itself into the intimate texture of our lives.³⁶

This view of the matter differs markedly from that which informs the work of Yates and particularly Wilder, because although they have shown that Shakespeare's plays *can* be understood with reference to the House of Memory which was circulating as an idea at the time of writing, to do so exclusively constricts our understanding of how, as Barish puts it, 'the dynamics of memory [. . .] weaves itself into the intimate texture of our lives'.³⁷ It is my contention that the conceptions of memory that circulated in Shakespeare's time cannot fully account for the art of memory he creates in the second tetralogy. Consequently I have turned to Kierkegaard's theory of repetition as a

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p.20, Wilder's emphasis.

³⁶ Jonas Barish, 'Remembering and Forgetting in Shakespeare', in *Elizabethan Theatre: Essays in Honour of S. Schoenbaum*, ed. R. B. Parker and S. P. Zitner (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), pp. 214-21 (pp. 219-20).

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 220.

way of explaining how the paradoxical notion of a memory of the future can exist and influence the characters and audience of the second tetralogy. This is another feature of my thesis that sets it apart from previous studies of memory in Shakespeare.

The final book I wish to review in this survey of studies which deal with memory in Shakespeare is Hester Lee-Jeffries' *Shakespeare and Memory*.³⁸ Like this thesis, Lee-Jeffries is interested in the way the past can reflect the future. She has a lot to say about shared memory and memory that connects us to 'who we are'³⁹ – in other words, memory's influence on identity. She also acknowledges that Shakespeare is interested in when memory becomes history, and vice versa. However, like Peter Holland, she concentrates on memory in performance. In her fourth chapter, 'Remembering England', she discusses the first tetralogy, *Henry V* and *Henry VIII*. She draws heavily on the RSC's *Histories* cycle (2007-8), emphasising 'the experience of performance' in order 'to consider what it might mean to remember in performance, as both an actor and an audience member.'⁴⁰ Lee-Jeffries makes many points I am able to agree with, and some which I am not, but ultimately her focus is not on the second tetralogy, just as mine is not on performance *per se*.

The third group of studies pertinent to this thesis are those which share my concern with memory specifically in the histories. In 'Hotspur's Poor Memory',⁴¹ Giles R. Mitchell and Eugene P. Wright discuss the two instances in Shakespeare's *1 Henry IV* where 'Hotspur forgets important details'.⁴² The first occurs when he cannot remember the name of Berkeley Castle (1.3.242ff.), and the second is when he forgets the map (3.1.3-6). They acknowledge E. H. Seymour, the only other critic 'ever to give Hotspur's forgetting more than a passing mention',⁴³ and then explain Hotspur's forgetting as parapraxis, 'that is, unconsciously motivated forgetting',⁴⁴ a theory 'consistent with the literal plot facts' and the fact that 'Hotspur has a deeply conflicted sense of honor'.⁴⁵ In my own account of Hotspur in Chapter 5, I interpret Hotspur's memory differently, looking not at these incidental lapses but at the larger issue of

³⁸ Hester Lee-Jeffries, *Shakespeare and Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁴¹ Giles R. Mitchell and Eugene P. Wright, 'Hotspur's Poor Memory', *The South Central Bulletin*, 43:4 (Winter, 1983), 121-3.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

Hotspur's conception of time: it is because Hotspur lives so viscerally in the present moment that his failures of memory are so aggravating to him; they force him to consciously exert his memory to retrieve the information he wants, rather than having it already at his command in the present. Although Mitchell and Wright furnish an interpretation of Hotspur's memory lapses, they do so in a cursory way and with little further explanation. Their essay is an example of heuristic memory-spotting, heuristic because the study cites instances of memory as a way of stimulating further investigation, rather than undertaking that investigation itself. Mitchell and Wright highlight the two instances of a character's memory malfunctioning in *1 Henry IV*, but fail to explain its impact on both plot and characters and thus on the play's wider concerns. Of course, Shakespeare's memorial arts *do* function in a heuristic way for the audience, his language creating and then drawing attention to memory. But it also raises further questions. For example, when on the eve of the battle of Agincourt Henry V remembers his predecessors Henry IV and Richard II in his speech 'Not today, O Lord, | O not today, think not upon the fault | My father made in compassing the crown',⁴⁶ why does he do so, and what is the effect of his recollection on him and on us? To ask – and to attempt to answer – such questions is one of the principal objectives of this thesis.

Another study which examines memory in the histories is Jonathan Baldo's 'Wars of Memory in *Henry V*',⁴⁷ which argues that Henry must manufacture the way Agincourt is remembered because it is critical to securing his power. Baldo's reading of the play is quite cynical: he seems oblivious to (or wilfully ignores) the suggestion that Hal can be viewed as heroic. It is true that making memory is the play's and the characters' work, but it does not follow that the different versions of events they build through those memories are necessarily tainted by their method of production. I discuss this in more detail in Chapter 7, paying particular attention to Henry's speech on the morning of the Battle of Agincourt. I intend to show through this close reading, and others like it in the other chapters on the plays, how Shakespeare complicates memories through language, and creates identity and history through memories. This

⁴⁶ William Shakespeare, *Henry V*, ed. T. W. Craik, Arden third series (Thomson Learning: London, 2005), 4.1.289-303.

⁴⁷ Jonathan Baldo, 'Wars of Memory in *Henry V*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 47:2 (Summer, 1996), 132-59 (p. 133).

is something quite different from what studies of memory in the histories such as Baldo's have undertaken to demonstrate.

Baldo develops his argument in *Memory in Shakespeare's Histories*, which includes an amended version of his 'Wars of Memory in *Henry V*'. In the book, Baldo contends that forgetting occupies a key position in Shakespeare's second tetralogy because of two things, 'an emergent nationalism and the Protestant Reformation',⁴⁸ calling the latter 'the elephant in the room' of Renaissance studies.⁴⁹ In four chapters - one for each of the plays of the second tetralogy - Baldo strives to show how the characters in the tetralogy attempt 'to produce a more uniform perception of the past that political theorists associate with nationhood',⁵⁰ whereas I see the plays as achieving the opposite - a continuously emerging history made from the varied and numerous memories circulated by many characters. Shakespeare writes a tetralogy which explores its own relationship with recycling past history, and which vigorously demonstrates that the power of remembering lies with a whole range of characters, and not just those at the top who, according to Baldo, want to consolidate the national memory. As the subtitle of the book suggests, Baldo is also far more focused on forgetting than I am. He discusses how the plays 'explore both the virtues and the difficulty of forgetting in an era of radical social change',⁵¹ which, while fascinating, is not the remit of the present thesis.

The fourth group of studies relevant to my thesis are those which deal with prediction or anticipation in Shakespeare, because prolepsis understood as 'the memory of the future' plays a vital role in the second tetralogy. In 'Shakespeare's Narrative: Acts of Memory', Barbara Hardy argues that Shakespeare 'reflects and reflects on the nature of memory, seeing the awareness of past, present, and future, as neither chronological nor linear, but a mesh of narrative emotions'.⁵² She also highlights the complex imaginative relationship between past and future in the plays: 'His imagination leans forward, its harkings back often need to be projected into the

⁴⁸ Jonathan Baldo, *Memory in Shakespeare's Histories: Stages of Forgetting in Early Modern England* (New York and London: Routledge, 2012), p. 2.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. ix.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁵² Barbara Hardy, 'Shakespeare's Narrative: Acts of Memory', *Essays in Criticism*, 39:2 (April, 1989), 93-115 (p. 93).

future. As he imagines memorial, he looks ahead to contemplate recall'.⁵³ This resonates closely with my view of prolepsis in the histories, but Hardy does not analyse or explain in detail *how* the future is imagined or anticipated through language, something I see as central to Shakespeare's employment of prolepsis in the second tetralogy. Hardy provides numerous examples of acts of memory in a wide range of plays, but fails to produce a subsuming rationale for Shakespeare's use of them. Her essay is an overview of memory in Shakespeare, which includes memorial, nostalgia, and forgetting, but she sees Shakespeare nevertheless as an incorrigible presentist: 'Shakespeare [. . .] is engrossed by the present, entranced by its immediacy, its experiences and images, freed or as freed as possible from category and the rotted words of retrospect.'⁵⁴ Like Joughin, she concentrates on the negative aspect of the characters' retrospective musings, seeing them as 'pain and losses': 'recalled occupations lose all their delight.'⁵⁵

Another essay concerned with anticipation is Leo Salingar's 'Memory in Shakespeare', which looks at the role of memory in *2 Henry IV*, *Hamlet*, and *The Tempest*, where mentions of memory and remembering are 'twice as frequent'⁵⁶ as in other plays by Shakespeare. He sees *2 Henry IV* and *Hamlet* as establishing a tension between recollection and anticipation of the future, and *The Tempest* as revealing memory as a liberating force. Salingar skates over incidences of memory in the early plays, before asserting that only in the Romances does 'Memory become a vital factor',⁵⁷ an assertion with which this thesis takes issue. *2 Henry IV* Salingar regards as a 'secular national history play'.⁵⁸ I, like him, note that the play 'thinks back to events' in *Part 1* and *Richard II*, and acknowledge that 'historical memory [is] embodied in Shakespeare's theatre'.⁵⁹ I also share his view that a 'complex pattern of memory and conjecture extends across the play'.⁶⁰ Salingar rightly recognises too that 'The private memories Shakespeare has invented contrast with the public, historical memories',⁶¹ but like Hardy, Salingar does not explain how this is achieved, nor does he comment on

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

⁵⁶ Leo Salingar, 'Memory in Shakespeare', *Cahiers élisabéthains*, 45 (1994), 59-64 (p. 61).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

what this contrast means for the plays. This dissertation aims to answer the questions that Hardy's and Salinger's work has raised but left unanswered.

In 'Shakespeare's Art of Preparation', Wolfgang Clemen argues that *Richard II* marks a change in the way Shakespeare presents anticipation (or 'preparation') in the history plays, 'being more than in the previous histories linked up with imaginative vision, subjective foreboding and poetic anticipation.'⁶² Clemen cites his earlier essay, 'Anticipation and Foreboding in Shakespeare's Early Histories',⁶³ which uses Shakespeare's sources, Hall and Holinshed, in order to establish how Shakespeare expanded the prophecies and warnings mentioned there, particularly in the speeches of characters like Gaunt, who are important as instruments of anticipation and foreboding. Building on this essay, in 'Past and Future in Shakespeare's Drama',⁶⁴ Clemen is the first to recognize that the generic difference of the histories makes the theme of anticipation in them particularly prominent, because 'In Shakespeare's histories an unfulfilled past calls for fulfilment in the future',⁶⁵ but he develops this idea only from the perspective of characters inside the play, and does not discuss how 'real' history flows round and through the plays. Nor does he consider how a sequence of plays can and does affect the audience's memory. Moreover, while he acknowledges that the connection between the two tetralogies affects 'the connection between past and future',⁶⁶ he concedes that the subject is so huge that it 'cannot possibly be treated extensively in a single lecture'.⁶⁷ I hope nevertheless within the compass of this dissertation to cast more light on this connection in the second tetralogy. Mine is the first sustained study of memory in the second tetralogy, that is, across a whole sequence of history plays considered as a sequence (Baldo's study, though it considers all four plays, is, as I have already remarked, primarily concerned with forgetting).

If Clemen fails to take the audience into account in his essay, Marjorie Garber more than makes up for this. In her essay, "'What's Past Is Prologue": Temporality and Prophecy in Shakespeare's History Plays', she observes that, in knowing how events in

⁶² Wolfgang H. Clemen, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art: Collected Essays* (London: Methuen, 1972), p. 37.

⁶³ Wolfgang H. Clemen, 'Anticipation and Foreboding in Shakespeare's Early Histories', *Shakespeare Survey 6: The Histories* (1953), 25-35.

⁶⁴ Clemen, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art*, pp. 124-46.

⁶⁵ Clemen, 'Anticipation and Foreboding in Shakespeare's Early Histories', p. 26.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁶⁷ Clemen, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art*, p. 125.

the play will turn out, the audience listens to prophecies and predictions and registers their truth and irony, but 'Because of the conventions of the theatre the audience cannot intervene, cannot speak out to tell the truth.'⁶⁸ Garber thinks about actual prophecies in the plays, such as those that are astrological or 'alphabetic' in nature.⁶⁹ Obvious examples include 'G' murdering King Edward in *Richard III*, the Welsh army's misgivings in *Richard II* (2.4.7-17), the prophecy of Henry IV's death in the Jerusalem chamber (2 *Henry IV*, 4.5.236-80), and the Bishop of Carlisle's prophecy in *Richard II* (4.1.134-47). My own focus, however, is less on the overt prophecies in the tetralogy than on the points where the prefiguration is more subtle and unobtrusive, but no less important for that. Garber views Hal's anticipatory 'I know you all speech' (1 *Henry IV*, 1.2.155-177) as 'a chilling thought'. This is a soliloquy I also reflect on in this thesis, but I take a different view of it. My account of anticipation in the histories recognises among other things the distinctive status of prophecies by characters whose futures seem to have been already decided for them by history. Although I agree with Garber on many points, and discuss her ideas more fully in my chapter on *Richard II*, it is in my application of the Kierkegaardian theory of repetition to our understanding of anticipation in these plays that I differ most significantly from her.

In 'Prophetic Behavior in Shakespeare's Histories', Kirby Farrell investigates the premonitions of Richard III and Hal in their respective plays, although his conclusions about the function of anticipation are quite different for the two plays. He argues that Richard III's fate shows Shakespeare's disapproval of his fight for control of the future, and notes that, ultimately, characters may seem to prophesy but they 'believe destiny [is] shaped by prophetic powers beyond their control',⁷⁰ which touches on the idea that anticipation in the plays can be a function of the play as much as an activity of the characters. Hal, meanwhile, pushes against the "'hopes" and predictions of others, especially his father',⁷¹ engaging with Christian eschatology to invoke a future competing with the dark prophecies of those around him. The opposite ways in which Richard and Hal encounter and evoke anticipated events in their respective plays 'calls

⁶⁸ Marjorie Garber, "'What's Past Is Prologue": Temporality and Prophecy in Shakespeare's History Plays', in *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History and Interpretation*, ed. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1986), pp. 301-31 (p. 304).

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 318.

⁷⁰ Kirby Farrell, 'Prophetic Behavior in Shakespeare's Histories', in *William Shakespeare: Histories*, ed. Harold Bloom (New York: Infobase, 2009), pp. 43-66 (p. 46).

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

attention to the insoluble doubleness in human experience'⁷² and shows Shakespeare as a playwright who:

honors irrational depths of experience. Given our own historical situation, we are disposed to appreciate the way prophecy and prophetic dreams may dramatize the unconscious forces shaping experience. As critics we readily applaud the plays' demystification of historical process.⁷³

Farrell concludes that 'In the histories Shakespeare appears to be expanding the imagination of his time, encouraging his audiences to face more openly the immensity and contingency of history. I like to think that the plays serve to demystify history'.⁷⁴ There is much I agree with in Farrell's essay, although my study differs from his in its focus on all the plays in the tetralogy, and in the depth in which it investigates the phenomenon of anticipation in those plays. Farrell also does not link prophecy to memory in the way that I do in Chapter 2.

The last study of anticipation in Shakespeare's history plays that I want to touch on is Harry Berger's analysis of *Richard II* in *Imaginary Audition*. Unlike Garber, Berger sees prolepsis in less obvious places, for example, in the speeches beginning 'Were my brother, nay, my kingdom's heir' (1.1.116), 'Depose him in the justice of his cause' (1.3.30) and 'We will descend and fold him in our arms' (1.3.54-8).⁷⁵ He also offers close readings of speeches throughout *Richard II*, including the mirror scene (4.1.277-89), but his concern is not centred on memory *per se*. The most illuminating chapter in the book for me is 'The Fight for the Future Perfect', where Berger shows how Richard's language looks towards the future. His key argument is that the scene in which Richard arrives from Ireland at Barkloughly Castle (3.2) serves as 'a staging ground, a preparatory sparring session, for the public confrontations in 3.3 and 4.1'.⁷⁶ Berger maintains that Richard uses the future perfect in order to impose a performed version of himself on the audience and the characters in the play. His reading is quite a cynical one, which reduces Richard to a 'Slit-eyed Analyst'.⁷⁷ I would argue, however,

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 62.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

⁷⁵ Harry Berger, *Imaginary Audition: Shakespeare on Stage and Page* (London: University of California Press, 1989), p. 55.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

that Richard has less control of his language than Berger allows, and that he is able to conceive only briefly of an alternative to his life as a king, as Chapter 4 will show.

All the instances of anticipation in the second tetralogy are saturated with irony for anyone who knows anything of the historical events they dramatise. But unlike previous critics I see two crucial differences between dramatic irony and anticipation in the plays. Firstly, irony in a speech or situation is usually perceived only by the audience but not grasped by the characters in the play; whereas with anticipation as I understand and explain it in Chapter 2, often the characters too have a sense of the significance of their situation, as Gaunt does when he voices a premonition of doom in *Richard II*. Both characters and audience become simultaneously aware of the ominous nature of the situation. Secondly, dramatic irony in the normal sense almost always occurs when the audience has remembered a previous speech or event which casts light on the current speech or situation; in the case of anticipation as I see it, it is a question rather of the current or present speech or situation recalling a future speech or event. This is a distinction whose consequences have not hitherto been as fully appreciated or explored as they deserve to be.

Although there are many points of convergence between myself and the diverse authors of this fourth group of studies dealing with anticipation in Shakespeare, and in the history plays in particular, my thesis examines this feature of the plays in unprecedented depth and detail and draws different conclusions about it. Even where critics writing about anticipation in the histories have recognised that memory serves in these plays to look forward to the future as much as to preserve the past, none of them has developed these insights into a full reading of the tetralogy as a whole or its component plays. Nor have they looked in a sustained way at the engineering of memory, at how memories are forged through the language the characters speak. What I endeavour to demonstrate in this thesis is that, while the historical events of the plays may be presented in the order of their occurrence, the focus of the plays is on the creation of the memories of these events through language, with characters looking forwards and backwards throughout, and events variously both repeating previous ones and anticipating future ones. As a result the composition and exposition of memory can take the place of history *per se*. This thesis breaks new ground in three main respects. Firstly, it is *different in scope* from previous studies: it is the first sustained study of memory in the entire second tetralogy, and the

first to perceive the second tetralogy as an act of memory in itself. It is also the first to explore how the plays produce knowledge or awareness of how memory works. Secondly, it is different in the *depth and detail* of its analysis: it is the first study to offer sustained close readings of key speeches in the second tetralogy that show how language, rhetoric, and syntax can create memories. And thirdly, it differs in its *method* from previous studies in so far as it is the first to apply the Kierkegaardian theory of repetition to aid our understanding of what memory is, and how it works, in the second tetralogy.

Structure, Scope and Aims of Thesis

In order to achieve these objectives, I propose to begin by describing the key concepts round which my thesis revolves and explaining their role in my reading of the second tetralogy. Thus, in the first section of Chapter Two, I examine definitions of ‘memory’, ‘history’, and the ‘art of memory’, and make clear which definitions I have in mind when discussing memory and memories in the second tetralogy. The second section of Chapter Two considers the phenomenology of memory, particularly what the memories in the plays are of and whose memories they are: the audience’s, the nation’s, and the characters’. Memories can be more powerful than present life; they can hold a person, real or imagined, in thrall. Memories can be positive or negative, and how much they can be manipulated is a matter of almost constant dispute in the second tetralogy. Through the exploration of different types of memory it becomes clear that collective memory or history can be in conflict with individual memory, even though both may exist in the same situation. The third section of Chapter Two investigates the direction of memory in these plays, exploring the Kierkegaardian notion of repetition, which I call forward recollection, as a new way of understanding the way premonition and prediction work in the plays as a kind of memory of the future. I argue that this kind of memory is characteristic of these plays, because they deal with known and past events which are experienced by characters that are living them for the first time in the dramatic present. I explain how, although our modern knowledge of the past the second tetralogy recounts is crucial to recognising all the instances of forward recollection in the plays, forward recollection could also have

worked for the original audience, some of whom may well have known much less about the events being staged for their entertainment.

I begin Chapter Three with a section exploring the dramatic form of the works as a vehicle for the transmission of memories, focusing on three aspects of drama: theatre's memories, the actors' memories, and the audience's memories. The physical location and structure of the theatre can affect the audience's memories and its reception of a play; indeed, *anything* about a theatrical performance can carry memories which affect its reception and interpretation. Then there are the actors, who struggle not only with characters who – in the case of the history plays – often have to represent real people who were once alive, but also with the memory of actors who have played the same parts before them. And they do this while their own bodies bear the memories of their previous roles, and while the audience may well be remembering and comparing the actor's current role to parts they have played before. Then I examine different aspects of the audience's memory, including how much Shakespeare's audience might have already known about the history he was presenting them with in his plays. In a subsequent section, I write about the different concepts of time which circulated during the Renaissance, and the effects of this on how memories are made, understood, and used by the characters in the plays. In a final section, I also explain which aspect of language I have chosen to focus on in each of the play chapters.

The rest of the thesis is devoted to close readings of significant parts of each of the plays of the second tetralogy. It is designed to substantiate the arguments of the first three chapters by showing how Shakespeare creates and complicates memories in the plays. Each of these chapters takes as its focus one key concern of the tetralogy which is illuminated when examined with memory in mind, and which in turn exemplifies the plays' wider concerns with memory.

Thus Chapter 4 on *Richard II* focuses on how memories create, complicate and destabilise identity. By considering places in the play where characters remember and discuss Richard, and by reflecting on Richard's own memories of himself, I consider both identity and subjectivity (these two are differentiated in the chapter). *Richard II* reveals memories which expose the potential for the experience of other subjectivities, even if in the closing analysis such options are beyond Richard's reach. The end of the chapter considers two instances of forward recollection in the play which, like the

remembered past, work to render Richard's identity opaque, but from the perspective of a prophesised future, predicting a time to come while remembering times past.

Chapter 5 on *1 Henry IV* takes up the subject of memory and time. The play shows us different attitudes to time, exposed by characters' memories. Both Hal and Hotspur worry about claiming the future as theirs, though they have different ways of trying to bring that future about. Falstaff, however, rejects the linear time with which Hal and Hotspur engage, resulting in a life lived viscerally in the present moment. To others in the play who fail to see or understand the benefits of snubbing clock time, Falstaff seems foolish, but he is freed from the strictures of what history may demand of characters' actions and fate. Falstaff's plural memories open up unconventional ways of being. My chapter on *Richard II* shows how Richard's memories tie him into a traditional and conventional movement into the future, and Hal suffers from this too. But Falstaff rejects the assumption that the past must always decide the future, and thus, unconstrained by the burdens of time, his memories enable him - and the audience - to imagine an alternative future.

Chapter 6 on *2 Henry IV* considers the issue of memory and death. The play opens with Rumour, who gives voice to competing beliefs about who is dead, confirming that memories cannot always be made to accomplish what characters may wish them to. Rumour's speech is the first of many examples in the play where memories of the dead differ widely between the individuals possessing them, fuelling disagreement and contention. The characters' memories of the dead and their connections with their dead in the play empower the audience to interrogate the veracity of the historical memories offered them. There are many contrasting attitudes to the dead in the play, but I focus on three in particular. The first attitude is advocated by the rebel party. We see Northumberland mourning his dead son, Hotspur, but being consoled by his peers, who urge him to continue with the war in honour of the memory of the dead king, Richard, whose blood was 'scrap'd from Pomfret stones' (1.1.204-5). The rebels see the commemoration of the dead as an act of justice; they remember past misdeeds in order to avenge wrongful death. The second approach is espoused by Justice Shallow. Shallow blends clichéd meditations about dead friends with comments about the prosperous Stamford fair; his speech puts memories of the dead on the same level as the affairs of those still alive in an amusing way which does not privilege the departed over those left behind. Shakespeare uses Shallow's

language, particularly his many repetitions, to demonstrate the actors' memories at work. This allows the actors to share in the experience of memory with the characters, as my chapter will explain. The third outlook on death which the play offers us is furnished by King Henry on his deathbed at the close of the play. The king seems to want both to erase the memory of his deposition of Richard, so that peace will be restored to the land, and for the court to remember that his son Hal is lineally descended from him, in order to give his reign the legitimacy that Henry IV's did not possess. King Henry recognises the manifold nature of memory: he knows that memories have an effect (whether desirable or otherwise) when present; and that memories can fail to have a required effect when absent. But he does not acknowledge the power of memories to *disregard* the inconsistent obligations he tries to impose on them. These three different approaches to commemorating the dead show that memory is asked to fulfil many different functions. It is therefore little wonder that the memories constructed of the dead are always depicted as disputable.

Chapter 7 focuses on forward recollection in *Henry V*. Forward recollection is vital for the characters of the second tetralogy because it allows them the possibility, even if it remains unrealised, of being more than their historical roles seem to allow. The power to 'remember forwards' also allows the audience to imagine a future which is totally different from that envisaged by the characters or implicit in the play as a whole. In this chapter I concentrate on the two main opportunities the play gives the audience to create memories of the future: the Chorus's speeches and Henry's speech before the battle of Agincourt. Their use of language means that the Chorus and Henry are not always entirely successful in forging memories, the effect of which, however, is to grant the audience even more space and licence to forge their own.

In the concluding chapter I summarise what I have done in this thesis, the method I have employed to achieve its objectives, and why it matters - what difference it makes to our understanding of the plays of the second tetralogy and the central role played in them by memory. I provide a concise close analysis of a speech from *Macbeth* to illustrate and restate the main points of this thesis in fresh terms, and to demonstrate how the argument of this thesis could be developed and applied to other plays by Shakespeare.

CHAPTER TWO: DEFINITIONS AND PHENOMENOLOGY OF MEMORY

Taxonomy

What is memory?

Discussing memory demands a definition of memory - or at least, an attempt at one, since it is clear that there are many different notions of what the term means. The entry on memory in the *OED*, which runs to over 11,000 words, records twenty-four senses of the word, in addition to uses of the word in phrases, such as 'art of memory', which have their own meaning, and fifty compound uses. Memory can be recollected, preserved, recorded, lost, found, created, and destroyed. Something or someone can exist within or fade from living memory. We can draw on memory or bury things in it; we can commit something to memory; we can be haunted by memories. Memory can be personal, collective, social or cultural - the latter three assuming a shared perception of the past.¹ There is no one definition of memory, and to define the term too precisely closes down all the semantic possibilities it harbours. Nevertheless, to say that memory loosely encompasses 'the multiple ways in which people conceive of the past'² strikes me as equally unsatisfactory. So for the purposes of this project I propose to go back to the Greek root of the word to establish what I understand memory to entail. The Greeks distinguished between *mnēmē*, 'memory as appearing', and *anamnēsis*, 'memory as searching'. The distinction acknowledges that (a) memory can both occur spontaneously (*mnēmē*), and be actively sought after (*anamnēsis*). Both things happen to characters in the plays, and both happen to the audience.

For example, sometimes the characters set off in search of memory; they actively seek it, like Hotspur and his faction deliberately remembering the reign of Richard II as a 'sweet lovely' time (*1H4*, 1.3.169-75): this is a case of *anamnēsis*. At

¹ See Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, trans. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press, 1992) and Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

² Samuel Hynes, 'Personal Narratives and Commemoration', in *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 206.

other times, memory simply occurs to the characters, such as Richard's unwanted memories of his time as king (*R2*, 4.1.281-86): this is an instance of *mnēmē*. For the audience likewise the distinction is between the attempt to make sense of the second, third and fourth play in the tetralogy by actively seeking to remember what transpired before (*anamnēsis*), and passively remembering something about the characters or plot at the prompting of the play – while overhearing a character's reminiscence, for example (*mnēmē*).

And what of 'recollection'? Here is a separate word, whose Greek equivalent is *anamimneskethai*. *Anamimneskethai* is the grammatically passive form of the verb 'to remind', so it means 'to be reminded', as when someone or something reminds one of someone or something else. In *1 Henry V*, Worcester reminds the king of the favours owed to the rebels: 'And yet I must remember you, my lord, | We were the first and dearest of your friends' (5.1.32-3). This happens continually in the plays of course: both the characters and the plays themselves serve to remind us of past times. Such recollections are similar to *mnēmē* since by their nature they are found without being actively sought.

Taken together, these three closely related but distinct modes of memory furnish a basic framework for the principal concerns of this thesis, allowing it proceed, in Paul Ricoeur's phrase, 'from memories to reflective memory, passing by way of recollection.'³

What is the difference between memory and history?

It may also be helpful here to explain how I distinguish memory from history. For my purposes, history is a narrative, often official, authorised or institutionalised, that appears in written form. This is borne out both by the etymological roots of the word in Greek (*ἱστορία*, 'inquiry', particularly in this context a written account of that inquiry), and in Latin (*historia*, a narrative of past events). It is likewise supported by the entries in the *OED*, the first entry of which defines history as 'a written narrative constituting a continuous methodical record', and the third entry of which states that history is 'the formal record of the past, especially of human affairs or actions'.

³ Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004), p. 4.

Shakespeare himself uses the word in this sense in *Cymbeline*: 'man who knows by history, report, or his own proof | What woman is...' (1.6.71).⁴

Thus Shakespeare's plays themselves as written documents or records do form a 'history' of sorts. But memories are more fluid, and can contain many different versions of 'history'; as many versions, in fact, as there are people to carry the memories of that time or that telling. Dermot Cavanagh, Stuart Hampton-Reeves and Stephen Longstaffe, the editors of *Shakespeare's Histories and Counter-Histories*, call official and unofficial versions of the past 'histories' and 'counter-histories' respectively, but I would distinguish instead between 'histories' and 'memories'.⁵ As I will go on to explain later, the medium of the plays helps to tell and transmit both history *and* memories.

What is the art of memory?

We use our memory all the time, albeit unconsciously; the things we have by heart such as spellings and multiplication tables are most likely to have been learnt by rote in a formal setting such as school. Now more than ever, though, we increasingly rely on books and files on our computers and on the internet to remind us of things we might have memorised in times gone by. But it was not always so; this sort of learning and reliance on texts (printed and digital) has to a large extent replaced the learning and application of the art of memory, so much so that few now know what the art of memory actually is. Simply put, the art of memory is a mnemonic device, a system which facilitates the storage and subsequent retrieval of information: 'an art, for a medieval scholar, was a method or set of prescriptions that added order and discipline to the pragmatic, natural activities of human beings.'⁶ The key to the art of memory is the premise that one remembers images more readily than words. If they are to be remembered, words should be attached to images and placed in a certain order. The recommended method was to memorise a street or all the rooms in a house and then

⁴ William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, ed. Martin Butler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

⁵ Dermot Cavanagh, Stuart Hampton-Reeves and Stephen Longstaffe (eds), *Shakespeare's Histories and Counter-Histories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), p. 5. On this point, see also Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Discourse* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973) and *Tropics of Discourse* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978); Michel de Certeau, *The Writing of History*, trans. Tom Conley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992).

⁶ Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 42.

place what was to be remembered at intervals along the street or in the house. Then all one had to do to remember the things was to take an imaginary walk down the street or through the house, noting the carefully placed objects in order. This particular type of 'places and images' scheme of artificial memory is called by Frances Yates the 'Ciceronian mnemonic'⁷ and by Mary Carruthers an 'architectural mnemonic',⁸ but it amounts to the same thing, and prevailed for centuries as the principal means of preserving and retrieving information.

There were three main classical sources for this art of memory, all discussed in detail by Frances Yates in *The Art of Memory*. We do not know for certain whether Shakespeare had access to these sources, but as a grammar school boy it is likely that he would have been versed in some of them, particularly in the case of the second source, which could be found in a textbook on rhetoric. I will now describe in more detail each of the three classical sources for the art of memory, but on the understanding that, although the first written examples of how the art of memory works can be found in these Latin texts, the actual constitution of memory as an art is older, as the myth of its invention by the Greek Simonides suggests (see source one below).⁹ However, although the art is not new, the term 'art of memory' is, according to Yates, really a medieval neologism coined by Albertus Magnus.¹⁰ So to the three sources.

The first is the *De Oratore*, by Marcus Tullius Cicero, Book 2 350-360 (1st century BC),¹¹ which recounts the story of the poet Simonides of Ceos providing entertainment at the banquet of Scopas of Thessaly. As well as the customary praises of his host, Simonides's lyric poem included praise of the gods Castor and Pollux, twins of the Gemini constellation and patrons of sailors. Because Simonides's panegyric sang Scopas's praises for only half the time, Scopas paid Simonides only half the agreed sum, asking him to claim the rest from the gods he had so eloquently extolled. Shortly afterwards Simonides was called outside, where two gentlemen were apparently waiting to see him, but on reaching the grounds he found them empty. In his absence

⁷ Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Pimlico, 1992), p. 18 and *passim*.

⁸ Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p. 89.

⁹ Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p. 17.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 90; although the *OED* states: 'The title page of *Oratoriae Artis Epitomata*, a work by Jacobus Publicius printed at Venice in 1482, is apparently the first to mention *memoriae ars*. For an earlier use of *ars memoriae artificialis* in a 14th-century Italian source see F. A. Yates *Art of Memory* (1966) iv. 90.'

¹¹ Marcus Tullius Cicero, *De Oratore* (Charleston: BiblioLife, 2008).

all the guests at the banquet, including the miserly Scopas, were killed when the roof collapsed on top of them. The bodies were so badly crushed that relatives coming to claim the corpses of their loved ones could not recognise them. However, Simonides was able to help them by remembering where the guests had been sitting around the table, and consequently realised that arranging the items to be remembered in a methodical, systematic way, in exact locations, could aid memory. The key was to have a place or *locus* – in this case, the banqueting table – in or around which the items to be remembered could be placed.

The second classical source is the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, (of unknown authorship, although previously attributed to Cicero), Book 3 (86-82 BC),¹² which is the most detailed. It is essentially a text book detailing the five parts of rhetoric including *memoria*. It is the author of *Ad Herennium* who discriminates between natural memory, which is what one is born with, and artificial memory, which is one strengthened by using the art of memory. A good natural memory can be improved by tuition in the use of the art of memory. Other than the anecdotal Simonides story, the *Ad Herennium* is the earliest book to describe and then discuss the method of *loci* ('places') on which to put the 'images' (things to be remembered). The *Ad Herennium* focuses on the uses of the method to memorise speeches, and as a rhetoric Reader it was widely transmitted throughout Europe. But it was also hugely influential in a number of different disciplines, as can be seen from the volume of texts over the following centuries which appropriate the *loci* method as the key to the art of memory. Its enduring influence on the texts of the medieval and Renaissance worlds is hard to overestimate. Indeed, as Yates confirms:

Every *Ars memorativa* treatise, with its rules for 'places', its rules for 'images', its discussion of 'memory for things' and 'memory for words', is repeating the plan, the subject matter, and as often as not the actual words of *Ad Herennium*.¹³

The third classical source for the art of memory is Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, Book 2 (1st century AD),¹⁴ written a century after Cicero's *De Oratore*. There is quite a discrepancy between how Quintilian sees the art of memory and how Cicero

¹² Unknown author (attributed to Cicero), *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1999).

¹³ Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p. 21.

¹⁴ Marcus Fabius Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* (Charleston, S.C.: Forgotten Books, 1999).

and the author of the *Ad Herennium* do: Quintilian is critical of remembering 'places' in which to place images and words. He argues that this is an odd method, because remembering places in order to remember something else in that place doubles the work of the person remembering – why not just forget the 'places' and remember the things? Quintilian offers no personal explanation of why he thinks the classical method is at fault. Is it because he has trouble visualising things? Is it because Roman society had 'moved on'¹⁵ from the Ciceronian mnemonic? The latter explanation seems unlikely given that the Ciceronian mnemonic was still being discussed in the Renaissance. Whatever the reason, the important point is that of the three sources it is the second, the *Ad Herennium*, which was most widely accepted and circulated in the Western world in the centuries following its publication; if Shakespeare came into contact with any of these sources, it is most likely to have been the *Ad Herennium*.

The art of memory enjoyed a renewed vogue in the Renaissance, and if Shakespeare did not encounter it in the Classical sources he almost certainly did in the more modern treatises, through the libraries of his patrons or simply because 'the tradition of the *ars memorativa* was [. . .] a fixture in early modern English popular culture'.¹⁶ Yates describes an array of Renaissance memory treatises,¹⁷ but here I want to survey three treatises in particular, none of which is given more than a passing mention by Yates, but all of which played a part in the Northern (as opposed to the Italian) Renaissance; that is, they were available in English and in the same century in which Shakespeare was writing the second tetralogy.

In 1545 Ravennas Petrus's *The Phoenix*¹⁸ was published in English, translated from a French copy, and is probably the best known of the memory 'textbooks' of the time. It aimed to help the lay reader in the practical application of the art to aid them in remembering things in their day-to-day lives. When it comes to *loci*, Petrus suggests four golden rules: that they be appropriate 'niches' to place images in, such as windows, pillars and corners; that they be not too spread out or far apart from each other; that they be not too noisy or distracting; and that they be not too high up or out

¹⁵ Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p. 41.

¹⁶ Carol Camden, 'Memory, the Warder of the Brain', *Philological Quarterly*, 18:1 (January, 1939), 52-72. See also Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p. 130, and William E. Engel, *Death and Drama in Renaissance England: Shades of Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 48.

¹⁷ See Yates, *The Art of Memory*, Chapter 5: The Memory Treatises, pp. 114-34.

¹⁸ Ravennas Petrus, trans. Robert Copland, *The art of memory, that otherwyse is called the Phenix A boke very behouefull and profytable to all professours of scyences. Grammaryens, rethoryciens dialectyke, legystes, phylosophres [and] theologiens* (London: William Middleton, 1545), n. pag..

of the person's reach. He boasts of having remembered over 1000 such loci, collecting them on his travels. He goes on to list specific examples of how he has remembered texts, people, and numbers by placing them in these pre-remembered *loci*, and hopes the reader will be able to do likewise.

In 1562 Guglielmo Gratarolo's *The Castle of Memory*¹⁹ was published in English, translated from the Italian. It is the longest of the three treatises I am considering here, since it not only discusses the art of memory but also has a large section on the physiology of memory, that is, on the memory's location in the brain (what we would understand today as the hippocampus) and what treatments can be applied to retrieve memory lost through inebriation, dementia or cranial trauma. What I want to highlight, however, are three points of particular relevance to this dissertation.

Firstly, when Gratarolo turns to consider artificial memory towards the end of the text, he touches on the idea of the memory being linked to the soul: 'But Memorye is a retaynyng of the Images or symilitudes first per|ceyued of the soule, the which neuer|theles is vnprofytable except it both retayne all, and also restore theym in the same order wherein it concey|ued theym.'²⁰ This idea is underscored in the 'memory theatre' treatises discussed below. In *The Castle* it occupies a single sentence, but through it we glimpse the destination the idea of the art of memory will reach in Renaissance treatises over the following decades. But *The Castle* swiftly returns to the well-trodden path of repeating the classical sources as examples of 'artificial memory', such as the *Ad Herennium* and Cicero's Simonides story. He also mentions Erasmus, Plato and Aristotle. Gratarolo even borrows from Petrus's *The Phoenix*, choosing as the building for his *loci* 'a great and emptie house', with the loci spaced out in the same way as Petrus recommended. A second interesting sentence from *The Castle* maintains that:

Verses also doe helpe muche to the stedfastnes of the Memorie by reason of y^e order of the compos[ition] & good makynge, not rashly wandering or strayinge

¹⁹ Guglielmo Gratarolo, trans. William Fulwood, *The castel of memorie wherein is conteyned the restoring, augmenting, and conseruing of the memorye and remembraunce, with the safest remedies, and best preceptes therevnto in any wise apperteyning: made by Gulielmus Gratarolus Bergomatis Doctor of Artes and Phisike. Englished by Willyam Fulvvod. The contentes whereof appeare in the page next folovvyng* (London: Roawland Hall, 1562), n. pag..

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 'The sixte Chapter expresseth Philosophicall Iudgementes, rules, and precepets or Remembraunce', n. pag..

abroade, but closed and shutte vp in certaine limittes and measures, in such sorte that they suf|fer not the mynde to wander and erre.²¹

As I hope to show, the verse form of the plays, particularly in *Richard II*, do indeed produce memories which are 'shut up in certain limits and measures'. Thirdly, *The Castle* also mentions how printed books are destroying the art of memory, since no one need bother to remember anything any more, because they can always look it up: 'the confydence of bookes [is] the cause, wherby we doe | lesse exercyse our Memorye.'²² This has particular interest for the study of Shakespeare's plays, because they were first and foremost presented in a spoken form. The actor's profession was one which, before the advent of printed scripts, made special demands on memory. Indeed, Jens Bartelson argues that 'the English theatre had evolved in tandem with the art of memory since the early Renaissance.'²³ Ironically, then, the continued existence of Shakespeare's plays in *printed* form has aided his project of creating memories of the history in his plays that would survive in the vernacular of his audience; eighteen of his plays would be lost to us were it not for the First Folio.

The final memory treatise I wish to highlight is Robert Albott's *Wits Theatre of the Little World* (1599). This included a section entitled 'Of Wit and Memory',²⁴ which is a compendium of ancient mentions of memory and the art of memory – a concise thesaurus of phrases, quotations and miscellanea. The pairing of 'wit' and 'memory' is particularly striking –memory usually fell under the auspices of the study of Rhetoric in treatises of the age. By 'wit' Albott means something close to 'intelligence', as in his example: 'The Schollers of Pythagoras learned his precepts by hart, vsing their wits & memo|ries for bookes.'²⁵ Certainly in the anecdotes Albott uses he mingles examples of good wit freely with examples of good memory, as if the two were akin. This idea proved especially productive for my discussion in Chapter 5 of Falstaff as a depository of wit and memory in *1 Henry IV*.

²¹ *Ibid.*, n. pag..

²² *Ibid.*, n. pag..

²³ Jens Bartelson, Chapter 2, 'We Could Remember It for You Wholesale: Myths, Monuments and the Constitution of National Memories', in *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics (Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present)*, ed. Duncan Bell (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 33-53 (p. 47). See also Yates, *The Art of Memory*, pp. 310-57.

²⁴ Robert Albott, 'Of Wit and Memory', in *Wits Theatre of the Little World* (London: Nicholas Ling, 1599), pp. 57-61.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

It needs to be said that all Albott's examples are from classical sources; indeed, all these Renaissance treatises look back to, borrow from, and build on classical and medieval sources. This fact led Yates to remark that 'the art of memory was a medieval and a scholastic art. [. . .] Thus, in the sixteenth century, the art of memory might appear to be on the wane.'²⁶ But something did happen to the art of memory that ensured its refashioning for the Renaissance world: it was remade by men who allowed it to take on magical or hermetic properties. Most famously, the Memory Theatre of Giulio Camillo (c.1480-1544) was an actual building made of wood which one could walk around, and which was supposed to make one able to recall everything in Cicero. An account of the time remarks that it is 'marked with many images, and full of little boxes',²⁷ which we can perceive were the *loci* in which to place Cicero's words and images. Although Camillo's project was famed throughout Italy and France, and despite the King of France being eager to see it and having contributed a fair sum of money to that end, in practice the theatre was never finished.²⁸ But from drawings made at the time we can see that it resembled an amphitheatre divided into seven 'steps', each of which corresponds to Roman gods, such as Jupiter, Mars, Mercury and Venus.²⁹ For me the key interest of the memory theatre lies in the fact that there is no audience; instead the person remembering is upon the stage, looking out at the auditorium of seven levels. It is also important to note that what makes the memory theatre so different from the other treatises of the time is that far from being a practical application of mnemonics to a weak memory, the theatre strives to unlock the viewer's remembrance of the world through an understanding of his place in it; it endeavours to make an authentic connection between the viewer and the viewed – which is to say, everything else. It attempts to make a spiritual – what Yates calls a 'cabbalistic'³⁰ – connection between man and God.

In England John Willis and Robert Fludd followed in Camillo's footsteps by imagining mystical memory theatres which had moved a considerable distance from the rhetorical techniques of Quintilian or Cicero. In 1618 John Willis had published

²⁶ Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p. 133.

²⁷ Desiderius Erasmus, *Selections from Erasmus: Principally from his Epistles*, ed. P. S. Allen (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), p. 479.

²⁸ Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p. 137.

²⁹ See Appendix 1 for a reproduction of Yates's diagram of this.

³⁰ Yates, *The Art of Memory*, pp. 152-3.

*Mnemonica: sive Ars Reminiscendi*³¹ in which he drew a series of theatres or 'repositories' to form his memory system. This consists of a slightly raised stage with a roof and a dividing column, so that he has two spaces in which to situate his *loci*. Each of the theatres is a different colour or a different size so that one can tell them apart. *Mnemonica* seems to be, in short, a variation on the familiar 'places and images' understanding of memory. But the following year Fludd's longer work *Utriusque Cosmi*³² borrowed from Willis and turned his concept into something much more occult and magical, just as Camillo did before him, 'inventing' a Theatre memory system which, Yates argues, sheds light on the Globe Theatre.³³ Yates has two chapters devoted to these men,³⁴ but they were publishing works on memory in 1618 and 1619 respectively, after Shakespeare's death, so if Shakespeare was influenced by them at all it would have been through the circulation of their ideas rather than their books. However, it is interesting that the one sentence of *The Castle* linking man's memory in his soul with God hints at the developments in thinking about the art of memory evident in the later decades of the century. It also explains why the art of memory remained in circulation during the Renaissance: although its origins were ancient, it had been reworked by its Renaissance practitioners to fit the needs and taste of the early modern world.

These treatises on the art of memory during both the classical era and more recently during the Renaissance are important, and worth reiterating as I have done, because they shed light on the tradition that Shakespeare most likely was aware of and would have been in dialogue with when creating, complicating and writing about memory in his plays. But they cannot fully account for the art of memory Shakespeare creates in the second tetralogy, because what he is doing with language is so radically different from the classic, 'places and images' architectural mnemonic discussed by other authors of his age, and different again from a magical or occult application of the art. It is this assertion which leads on to my next section, which investigates whether

³¹ John Willis, *Mnemonica; sive Ars Reminiscendi: e puris artis naturaeque fontibus hausta* (London: Humphrey Lowes, 1618). Part translation followed in 1621: John Willis, *The Art of Memory* (London: William Jones, 1621); and then the complete English text in 1661: John Willis, *Mnemonica: or, The Art of Memory* (London: Leonard Sowersby, 1661).

³² Robert Fludd, *Utriusque Cosmi majoris scilicet et minoris metaphysica atque technica historia in duo volumina secundum cosmi differentiam divisa* (London: 1619).

³³ Yates, *The Art of Memory*, pp. 324-6.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, Chapter 15: The Theatre Memory System of Robert Fludd, pp. 310-29, and Chapter 16: Fludd's Memory Theatre and the Globe Theatre, pp. 330-354. For more on Fludd see I. A. Shapiro, 'Robert Fludd's Stage Illustration', *Shakespeare Studies*, 2 (1966), 192-209.

and how Shakespeare used the art of memory in his work, and what that means for my own exploration of memory in the second tetralogy.

Did Shakespeare use the art of memory?

Lina Perkins Wilder has shown persuasively that Shakespeare's work can be read through the Renaissance art of memory as conventionally understood.³⁵ However, it is my argument that Shakespeare not only used but also created an 'art of memory' of his own, even if it is not one that Yates or Wilder would recognise, because it does not constitute or employ a prescriptive, logical system.

As was explained in Chapter 1, the distinction I am drawing is between an 'art of *memory*', in which the plays are concerned with memory, and an '*art* of memory' in which the *form* of the plays reveal and ponder the meaning and effect of memories. Shakespeare's art of memory works principally through the shaping and wording of his plays to reveal how crucial memories are to the understanding of identity, subjectivity, the individual's place in history and time, the significance of death and the individual's survival in memory after death. The close readings in the chapters on the plays will each take one of these issues and demonstrate how Shakespeare uses memories to show the audience that there is never one version of events, but multiple possibilities for interpreting past, present and future. As Walter Benjamin observed, 'Language has unmistakeably made plain that memory is not an instrument for exploring the past, but its theatre.'³⁶

As well as creating the memories of characters, Shakespeare plays with and complicates memories already inscribed in the basic plotlines of the second tetralogy, in his raw material drawn from history, thereby changing our perception of it. The result of Shakespeare's concentration in the plays on creating a formally unique, elaborate structure, and a singular configuration of dramatic speech, is his '*art* of memory'. The unrivalled dramatic and poetic power of Shakespeare's art of memory has helped to sustain interest to this day in his version of what is already known from chronicles, annals, and other sources. Wilder writes that:

³⁵ See Lina Perkins Wilder, *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre: Recollection, Properties, and Character* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

³⁶ Walter Benjamin, 'A Berlin Chronicle', in *Selected Writings 1927-1930: Volume 2 Part 1*, ed. Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland and Gary Smith (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2005).

most of those who wrote on early modern memory (Frances Yates, Lina Bolzoni, Mary Carruthers, William Engel) focus almost exclusively on early modern treatises on memory, and accept the treatises' emphasis on memory as a faculty that produces and recognizes order. Shakespeare's plays offer a different view of memory: they [. . .] embrace the disorderly, unwilling quality of memory that memory treatises normally seek to eliminate.³⁷

Wilder's statement is compatible with a *willed* embrace of an intense, '*unwilled* quality of memory' in the plays; in other words, a conscious examination of a facet of the plays – memory – that has not been consciously sought by its characters or its audience. This allows for the possibility that the plays actively and intentionally demonstrate the effects of remembering on groups of people, those from the past of whom the histories tell, those of the present to whom the histories are told, and, potentially, those of the future to whom the histories may yet be told. They engineer encounters in which the audience is jolted, transformed, or challenged in some way by memory.

The Phenomenology of Memory

The phenomenology of memory proposed here is structured around [. . .] questions: *Of what* are there memories? *Whose* memory is it?³⁸

Of what are there memories?

The study of the phenomenon of memory is at least as old as Plato and his writing on the Socratic dialogues, which proposed the notion that our soul existed before we were born and that we spend our lives fleetingly remembering things we have already known in the realm of Ideas.³⁹ This is similar to Plato's idea of 'Forms', according to which things are only weak imitations of reality. Learning thus becomes dependent on remembering rightly what we already know, an idea upon which I reflect further in the next section, 'Forward Recollection'.

³⁷ Wilder, *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre*, p. 6.

³⁸ Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, p. 3 (emphasis in original).

³⁹ See *The Republic*, 7.514a. More on Plato's theory of recollection can be found at *Philebus* 38E-39D, *Phaedo* 73D, *Timaeus* 26D, 71B (dreams), and *Theaetetus* 191C-196C (block of wax vs. aviary-storehouse ideas of memory). References are to John Madison Cooper and D. S. Hutchinson (eds), *Plato: Complete Works* (London: Hackett Publishing, 1997).

The study of memory *per se* did not really start properly until Aristotle's *De Memoria et Reminiscentia* (On Memory).⁴⁰ Aristotle's central claim is that the exercise of memory needs mental images, because the image serves as a facsimile of the 'true' object or experience we have had in the past. Thus, his work follows on from Plato. The strength of memory, and how accurate it is, depends on how closely the image resembles the true object; in other words, holding eidetic images is the way to a good memory. Aristotle also talks about how time constitutes memory, because our awareness of the image or thought that occurs to us relies on our perception that it occurred in the past. Understanding the temporal relationship between the object or experience in the past and the memory experienced in the present is vital to a good memory. So, for Aristotle, memory is made of images, and constituted by time.

Yet one of the best known (if brief) of the Western reflections on memory is to be found in Augustine's *Confessions* (X: 8-26) written in 397-8 AD, whose author famously discusses the 'great fields [and] spacious palace[s]' of memory.⁴¹ He describes entering his loci ('that huge court of my memory'), which clearly shows that the Romans were still using this device of the art of memory for remembering large quantities of information; quantities so large that Augustine wonders if there is any limit to them: 'It is a vast, immeasurable sanctuary. Who can plumb its depths?'⁴² Like Aristotle, Augustine is convinced that memories are 'the countless images of all kinds which are conveyed to it by the senses',⁴³ 'not inside me themselves, but only their images'.⁴⁴

To move from these classical examples to the plays of the second tetralogy is to find a phenomenology of memory which is focused not only on sight but on other senses as well. On his death-bed, Gaunt uses taste as the sense which best describes his impression and understanding of memory: 'the last taste of sweets, is sweetest last, | Writ in remembrance more than things long past' (*Richard II*, 2.1.12-4). Gaunt seems to think that things which have happened most recently are most readily remembered, but the experience of characters in the plays does not necessarily bear this out. There is a paradox at play here, because although Gaunt is speaking of

⁴⁰ See Richard Sorabji, *Aristotle on Memory* (Rhode Island: Brown University Press, 1972).

⁴¹ Saint Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. and intro. R. S. Pine-Coffin (London: Penguin, 1961), pp. 214-31 (p. 214).

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 216.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 214.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

sweetness, what has happened to him most recently is in fact a bitter experience, one which he regrets because it means that he will go to his death-bed dwelling on Richard's improprieties. In a further twist, Gaunt's observation is not just a paradox, but something more which bespeaks the chemistry of memory: Gaunt's bitterness cannot destroy the sweetness of his other memories, if only because we are far more likely to want to recall sweet memories than bitter ones. It may even suggest that there is something sweet even about bitter memories; that the action of recollection has a particular emotional involvement. Consider Marcel Proust, who described the involuntary memory evoked by a Madeleine:

a shudder ran through my whole body and I stopped, intent upon the extraordinary changes that were taking place. An exquisite pleasure had invaded my senses, but individual, detached, with no suggestion of its origin. And at once the vicissitudes of life had become indifferent to me, its disasters innocuous, its brevity illusory - this new sensation having had on me the effect which love has of filling me with a precious essence; or rather this essence was not in me, *it was myself*. I had ceased now to feel mediocre, accidental, mortal. Whence could it have come to me, this all-powerful joy?⁴⁵

The power of memory to seize the subject and freeze time is for Proust an 'extraordinary' 'joy'. Proust becomes possessed by memory – he writes, 'it was myself' - and it becomes a pleasure of his life and an actual presence. Both Gaunt's and Proust's observations, although spoken in different contexts and in very different frames of mind, show the precedence that memories of the past can take over present life. Yet to what degree memory is sweet or bitter is a matter for debate throughout the plays, because the characters repeatedly find that they can become slaves to memory. At times they try to induce recall when the word or thought just will not come (as when Hotspur forgets the name of Berkeley Castle in *1 Henry IV*, 1.3.242-47, and Fluellen forgets where 'Alexander the Pig' was born in *Henry V*, 4.7.12-3). Yet at other times they are helpless before the ravages of an unwanted memory, as Richard is in his prison cell (*Richard II*, 5.5). Memory is thus ethically very slippery – a harbinger of both good and ill. Indeed, 'Proust was careful to stress that this process [of objects triggering memory] was always haphazard, that objects could never be relied upon to

⁴⁵ Marcel Proust, *Remembrance of Things Past, Volume 1*, trans. C.K. Scott Moncrieff (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 2006), pp. 61, my emphasis.

deliver memories to consciousness.⁴⁶ Of what are there memories? Of things we do not want, as much as of things we do. And where does this leave Shakespeare's art of memory? It leaves him investigating not only the recollected elements of what is remembered, but also exploring the tangible act of remembrance itself, which, to return to the definitions with which I opened this chapter, manifests itself both as recall on command (*anamnēsis*) and as involuntary recollection (*mnēmē*).

Whose memory is it?

The Audience's

In the second tetralogy, I want to contend, Shakespeare shows the complexity of memory through his art, but whose memory is it that is complicated? His dramatic medium automatically assumes an audience, consisting not only of individuals who have seen or read the play, but of a group who have stood and sat together to hear it and come away with a shared perception of it, with what we might call a collective memory of the performance. Yet arguing that the plays generate a collective memory for the audience is dangerous, because it may imply that Shakespeare is bringing some kind of monolithic vision of the past into the present, or toeing some ideological line. In this section I will consider the term 'collective memory' and contemplate how much it can be experienced by an audience.

The notion of a collective memory is problematic in itself. Although, surprisingly, a definition of the term does not appear in the *OED*, it is commonly understood to mean a memory which is formed when a community constantly tells and retells its constitutive narratives, until most members of that community possess similar memories of their shared past. Yet there cannot be a fully collective memory of the plays insofar as each retelling through performance is a new one, and even at the same telling or retelling, each member of the audience takes away his or her own memories. As Duncan Bell observes:

⁴⁶ Adrian Forty and Susanne Kuchler (eds), *The Art of Forgetting* (Oxford and New York: Berg, 1999), p. 16.

While [. . .] memories can act as a social adhesive, they are always contestable, and it is in this realm of conflict, and the complex power relations that underpin and structure it, that the politics of memory is enacted.⁴⁷

Collective memory is only unethical when it is enforced, when it dissolves the notion of personal or individual agency and corresponding responsibility. If we conceive of collective memory instead as an aggregate of individual memories, it retains its fluidity and assumes a polyphonic quality; we need to maintain this notion of collective memory as a fraught, complex contestation of propaganda or ideology, whereby the heterogeneous audience is mobilized to bring their individual memories to bear on the plays. Shakespeare confirms this through the inclusion of the Chorus in *Henry V*, who implores the audience to make their own memories of the play before them, unhindered by what the stage can (and cannot) portray. 'Audience' may be a collective noun, but it is made up of individuals, and Shakespeare allows the diverse members of the audience to take individual possession of the memories in and of the plays.

This tension in the second tetralogy between collective and individual memories reflects a dispute that has raged in scholarship on memory for at least a hundred years:

Questions of identity have been central to debates over social memory since the turn of the twentieth century. The first 'memory boom', stretching from the *fin de siècle* into the 1920s, focused on the creation of largely homogeneous national identities. During the second 'boom', which gathered pace in the 1970s and continues to this day, attention switched more to the fragmentation of identities.⁴⁸

If we accept that 'The Elizabethan age is at once intensely national and intensely individualistic',⁴⁹ it is possible to see the plays as facilitating both collective memories based on shared nationhood and individual memories enabled by the unique identity of each spectator. An ethical dilemma arises from the control Shakespeare has over these memories, a dilemma from which the multivocal nature of his drama delivers him. He injects into his plays multiple perspectives, which allow his characters, and then the audience, and then critics in their turn, to exercise their own ethical power, which derives from the ability to disseminate information and ideas about the past

⁴⁷ Duncan Bell, *Memory, Trauma and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 5.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁴⁹ George Macaulay Trevelyan, *History of England* (London: Longmans, Todds, 1937), p. 323.

which do not necessarily agree. Not only the characters themselves but also audiences, actors, theatre directors, academics, and editors of Shakespeare transmit so many different versions of the plays that multiple interpretations become available to us, from the Elizabethan world picture of E. M. W. Tillyard,⁵⁰ to the postmodern undecidability of Norman Rabkin,⁵¹ to the future versions of the plays we cannot yet envisage.⁵² So the memories in and of the plays *are* the audience's; but not *only* theirs, as the following sections will show.

The Nation's

The construction of national identity through collective memories is a key issue in dealing with 'English' history plays. If we allow that Shakespeare is a theatrical chronicler of the English past, it seems reasonable to suggest that in the second tetralogy he creates for the nation memories of events between 1398 and 1420 (from the banishment of Bolingbroke during the reign of Richard II to the marriage of Henry V). This section will take a moment to reflect on the capacity of the history plays to form memories not only for specifically English audiences, but also for those on the continent and elsewhere.

Early modern English audiences' conceptions of themselves were doubtless affected by the portrayal of their nation's history onstage. Their identity was tied to the wars in which their ancestors fought; those wars brought to mind the wars they had faced in their own time, against the Spanish, for example, or the Irish. Ivo Kamps writes that:

there is no doubt that events such as the conflicts with Rome in the early part of the sixteenth century encouraged an interest in religious, legal, and parliamentary history, and that the strife with Spain in the second half of the century promoted a fervent patriotism that found an expression in nationalistic historiography.⁵³

⁵⁰ E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (London: Penguin, 1970).

⁵¹ For example, see Norman Rabkin, 'Chapter 2: Either/Or: Responding to *Henry V*', in *Shakespeare and the Problem of Meaning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), pp. 33-62.

⁵² See Kiernan Ryan, 'The Future of History: 1 and 2 Henry IV', in *Shakespeare*, 3rd edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), p. 65: 'Shakespeare's drama might be drawn as much towards a future beyond our own apprehension as back to its place of origin in the past'.

⁵³ Ivo Kamps, 'The Writing of History in Shakespeare's England', in *The Histories*, ed. Dutton and Howard, pp. 4-25 (p. 5).

The oft-quoted fifth chorus of *Henry V*, alluding to Essex's Irish campaign (5.0.29-34), is as good a testament as any to what might have been uppermost in Shakespeare's mind as he was writing, or the audience's mind as regards their and their nation's relationship with what they were watching. In a similar way, the plays have been re-interpreted for modern audiences with the advent of world wars and nuclear threats, so that they have become our history as well as the history of the early modern audience who lived four hundred years before us. Yet we do these plays a disservice if, like Kamps, we see in them simply 'an expression [of] nationalistic historiography.' The plays can be made to support that reading, and have been read like that by critics such as Jonathan Baldo,⁵⁴ but the beauty of Shakespeare's exploration of memory in the second tetralogy lies in the power of its diction and design to release alternative histories.

The plays can teach other nations about English history too, but the question is whether and why other nations would want to know about it. It may be that the characters or the language appeals more to them than the plots; or it may be that the plays tell them something about history and memories. There is much to recommend the argument that the English history plays 'came from England, they are about England, and they can be made to speak for England, but they have been discharged from their uniquely nationalist obligations.'⁵⁵ At least in the eyes of the famous German Shakespearean, August Wilhelm Schlegel, the importance of the history plays 'transcended any national or temporal limitations.'⁵⁶ This would mean that the history plays have a wider reach than an English audience alone, and thus can dramatise the complexity of memories for other audiences, too. John of Gaunt speaks of 'this England' (*Richard II*, 2.1.50), but what is 'this England'? If anything, the plays show us the slipperiness of a single concept of 'England,' because so many different characters of rival factions lay so many differing claims to it. Shakespeare reveals from the outset that there is no one England or 'Englishness', only a discussion about what these phrases mean. Gaunt's 'this England' in the first play in the tetralogy morphs by the

⁵⁴ See Jonathan Baldo, *Memory in Shakespeare's Histories: Stages of Forgetting in Early Modern England* (New York and London: Routledge, 2012).

⁵⁵ Ton Hoenselaars (ed.), *Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 8.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

final play in the tetralogy into Macmorris's repeated question, 'What ish my nation?' (*Henry V*, 3.2.124 and 126).

Indeed, what lends the word 'England' this ambiguity is the fact that these plays:

question what history is, and show us 'history in the making' in that they derive some of their dynamic from the clash between rival characters or rival groups who seem to make 'history'... in their own competing terms. The battle is over what is digested, *remembered*, understood.⁵⁷

And 'what is digested, remembered, understood' by history is as relevant for the English as it is for the Irish, the Scottish, or the Welsh, as well as for the French, the Germans, and the Italians. Samuel Leiter's *Shakespeare Around the Globe*, while far from exhaustive, lists as expected Canadian and American productions of the play, but also productions in Austria (*Henry V*), Italy (all four plays), France (*Richard II* and *Henry V*) and Germany (*Richard II*).⁵⁸

If I am speaking of a Shakespeare who makes his audience interrogate the memories of the historical events of the plays, I am speaking too of a Shakespeare who reveals to them something even deeper – an understanding of why those memories are important, how those memories are formed and retained, and how history is made from them. It is this which gives the plays the capacity to cross borders. Through his revelation of multiple memories in the plays of the second tetralogy, Shakespeare provides his audience with a broad vision of discursive plural histories which are not necessarily nationalistic or institutional, even though they deal with national issues.

The Characters'

Within the plays, characters feel the pressures of their memories, too. The division is principally between those who see the work of memory as responsible for forging or securing current political authority, and those who see the work of memory as the commemoration of ancient wrongs. In other words, the tetralogy seems to be at first glance a debate about memory between two opposing sides. One side feels that 'perceptions of the past are essential in both delegitimizing previous regimes and in

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 157 (my emphasis).

⁵⁸ Samuel L. Leiter, *Shakespeare Around the Globe: A Guide to Notable Postwar Productions* (New York and London: Greenwood Press, 1986). The full list of productions for *Richard II* is on pp. 569-92; for *1 and 2 Henry IV* on pp. 169-211; and for *Henry V* on pp. 213-31.

grounding new claims to political legitimacy.⁵⁹ It is by such means that Henry IV must delegitimize Richard II, and Henry V (to some extent) must disassociate himself from the usurper, Henry IV. Yet this work of memory is contested by “the other side” who feel that ‘the perceived duty of individuals and groups’ such as Hotspur, the Scottish, and Welsh, is ‘to remember past injustices.’⁶⁰ This side seeks to commemorate the dead and holds their memory dear. Ricoeur calls it a ‘duty’ of memory which ‘consists essentially in a duty not to forget.’⁶¹ In this respect amnesia becomes the opposite not of total recall, but of justice. As Jacques Derrida remarks in *Spectres of Marx*: ‘If I am getting ready to speak at length about ghosts, inheritance, and generations [. . .] it is in the name of *justice*.’⁶² Derrida speaks of a memory that enforces responsibility to the dead. I take up this topic in Chapter 6 on memory and death in *2 Henry IV*.

Ultimately, as the chapters on the plays will show, both parties fail to impose on memory the work they wish it to perform, because they cannot envisage a dialogical ethics which demands the acceptance of ‘multiple pasts, presents and futures.’⁶³ Collective memory of the type the opposing factions in the tetralogy struggle to impose is limited temporally and spatially because they are attempting to ‘harmonise autobiographical memories of past experiences.’⁶⁴ This is a fatal limiting factor, and one the plays resist by having no such restrictions of space or time. Instead, the plays to some extent ‘escape the bounds of experience’, because culture itself in championing Shakespeare as our pre-eminent playwright, transmits these memories down the generations, distributing memories which are as variable as ‘the stories that people and groups tell about their location (and meaning) in time’ over 400 years.⁶⁵ Shakespeare shows how memories can bear witness to a complexly remembered past, a past whose plurality it is our responsibility to stress.

⁵⁹ Duncan Bell, *Memory, Trauma and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 20.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁶¹ Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, p. 30.

⁶² Jacques Derrida, *Spectres of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*, trans. Peggy Kamuf, intro. Bernd Magnus and Stephen Cullenberg (New York and London: Routledge, 1994), p. xix (emphasis in original).

⁶³ Bleiken and Hoang, ‘Remembering and Forgetting in the Korean War’, p. 204.

⁶⁴ Bell, *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics*, p. 27.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

The Direction of Memory

‘It’s a poor sort of memory that only works backwards.’⁶⁶

Forward Recollection as memory

Aristotle insists that ‘it is not possible to remember the future [. . .]. Nor is memory of the present [. . .] memory is of the past.’⁶⁷ This view is logical, rational and easily understood. Memory looks backwards to the extent that when a character in the play says something which reminds us of something they said earlier, we mentally work backwards through the play and remember an earlier event, and this can happen naturally and even unconsciously. ‘But in fact,’ as Richard Sorabji argues,

there are many cases where it is not at all clear that this view is true. For example, one can remember a fact, how to do something, a number one has memorized, the flavour of honey, to feed the cat, [and] the way from A to B.⁶⁸

These are all instances where memory is not of the past. And there are other examples, more specific to the plays. When we re-read a play (which is already re-reading history), and come across the first instance of the character’s utterance, we can work forwards through the play to recall the later event to which it may refer – and this can happen as automatically as our memory leading us backwards through the play. In this way a delicate balance exists between the directions in which memory moves within the plays.

In his fascinating if somewhat bizarre book, *An Experiment with Time*,⁶⁹ John Dunne insists that we can all ‘remember’ the future if we can but clear our minds of the past. His argument is interesting and he uses mathematical evidence including diagrams with axes relating to time and space to support his claim. He thinks that it is easier to ‘remember’ the future in our sleeping dreams, when our conscious minds cannot interfere with what the mind is really capable of seeing, but that it would still be possible to ‘remember’ the future in our waking lives too, if we were more practised. Being young also helps, Dunne believes, as then we have more memories

⁶⁶ The White Queen in Lewis Carroll, *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass*, ed. Hugh Haughton (London: Penguin Classics, 2003), p. 172.

⁶⁷ Sorabji, *Aristotle on Memory*, 449^a9, p. 47.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁶⁹ J. W. Dunne, *An Experiment with Time* (London: Hampton Roads Publishing Co, 2001).

ahead of us than behind us. But the fact that his theory is little known and even less accepted (being considered by physicists to be a writer's explanation of time rather than a scientist's⁷⁰) shows its limited credibility. What Dunne could not establish in 220 pages will hardly be possible to establish in this chapter. Yet in terms of the history plays with which this thesis is concerned, it may be possible to explain how characters can indeed 'remember forwards'.

Søren Kierkegaard has given us a more sophisticated way of thinking about 'remembering forwards' in his essay *Repetition (Gjentagelsen)*.⁷¹ The essay was first published in 1843 under the pseudonym Constantin Constantius.⁷² It views backwards memory conventionally as 'recollection', but memory that points forwards as 'repetition', something I will call 'forward recollection' to distinguish it clearly from recollection that points backwards.⁷³ For Kierkegaard, 'repetition and recollection are the same movement, but in opposite directions.'⁷⁴ 'Recollection' works on Plato's model of remembering a truth which the individual already possesses but has simply forgotten; 'this is a movement backwards, since it is retrieving knowledge from the past.'⁷⁵ 'Repetition', on the other hand, works to discover truth which the individual has never known: 'the eternal (future) truth is captured in time.'⁷⁶ Applied to the plays of the second tetralogy, this means that, because they are linked, we must pay as much attention to prospective recollection as to retrospective memory; as much attention to premonitions and prophecies as to hindsight or nostalgia. It is a common belief that time is linear, moving inexorably from past to future. Yet it is precisely that movement which allows forward recollection to seize upon moments in the play and reveal them in a new context:

⁷⁰ My thanks to Anna Markowska of Surrey University for her help on this topic.

⁷¹ Kierkegaard applauds the Danish language for the phrase 'gentagelse', because it literally means 'taking again', which is much closer to what he wants to express than mere 'repetition'.

⁷² The pseudonym's Latin root means 'steady', 'firm', or 'stable' (hence our 'constancy'). Is Kierkegaard's implication that repetition bespeaks a sort of constancy to life, or is the author's name ironic, indicating that repetition and constancy are opposites? Certainly the author-narrator misunderstands repetition to the extent that he seeks it by literally repeating past actions – and is then disappointed when they do not provide him with the repetition he seeks.

⁷³ Søren Kierkegaard, *Repetition and Philosophical Crumbs*, trans. M. G. Piety, intro. Edward F. Mooney (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 3.

⁷⁴ Alastair Hannay and Gordon Daniel Marino (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Kierkegaard* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 287.

⁷⁵ The Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, a peer-reviewed academic resource: <http://www.iep.utm.edu/k/kierkega.htm>. Last accessed 30.07.2013.

⁷⁶ Stanford University's Philosophy pages: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kierkegaard/>. Last accessed 30.07.2013.

there are more directions to memory [. . .] than are dreamt of by our chronology. [. . .] [T]here is indeed a reason that 'history repeats itself,' and it is not just that if we fail to remember the past we are doomed to repeat it. We repeat it because human history is always unfolding in multiple directions simultaneously.⁷⁷

Forward recollection opens up the possibility of transforming our understanding of memory, or, as M. G. Piety puts it, 'Repetition provides new and vivid registers of perception.'⁷⁸

Forward recollection also resonates with the Nietzschean concept of eternal recurrence.⁷⁹ Essentially, eternal recurrence (also known as eternal return)⁸⁰ is the idea that the universe is endlessly repeated, and that we will all live our lives countless times, and have done so before:

This life as you now live it and have lived it you will have to live once again and innumerable times again... The eternal hourglass of existence is turned over again and again.⁸¹

Nietzsche only ever regarded his idea as a theory, not as an actual possibility, but the key to understanding this theory is to grasping time as cyclical, not linear as Kierkegaard's theory presumes. The idea is obviously not a new one, going back at least as far as the Mayans and Aztecs and ancient Egypt (whose symbol of eternal recurrence is famously the scarab or dung beetle), and thence to the disciples of Pythagoras and the Stoics in the Greek era, and from there to a conception of time popular in the Renaissance whose symbol was the Ouroboros.⁸² However, 'we must understand that Nietzsche does not recognise his idea of eternal return in his predecessors of antiquity.'⁸³

Paul Strathern is critical of the concept:

⁷⁷ Linda Charnes, 'Shakespeare, and Belief, in the Future', in *Presentist Shakespeares*, ed. Hugh Grady and Terence Hawkes (London and New York: Routledge, 2007), p. 66.

⁷⁸ Kierkegaard, *Repetition*, p. xvi.

⁷⁹ See §285 and §341 of Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science* (Dover: Dover Publications, 2006).

⁸⁰ In the original German, 'eternal return' is *ewige Wiederkunft*, and *ewige* is usually translated as 'perpetual'.

⁸¹ Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, p. 194.

⁸² The Renaissance understood, of course, both linear and cyclical models of time, as I will explain in my next section.

⁸³ Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson (London: Athlone, 1983), p. 29.

The idea of eternal recurrence turns out on inspection to be meaningless. Do we remember each of these recurring lives? If we do, we would surely make changes. If we don't, they are of no relevance. Even an arresting poetic image – and this is one – must have more substance if it is to be regarded as more than mere poetry. It is simply too nebulous to be used as a principle, as Nietzsche intended.⁸⁴

Strathern clearly does not perceive that Nietzsche's idea is about affirmation, about achieving a kind of salvation through positively embracing all our weaknesses and failures, and being so positive about our choices that we would choose them over and over again, eternally. The concept of eternal recurrence is not meaningless if we accept it existentially; it is the ethical principle of affirming what is contingent and so giving it the quality of the absolute. As Gilles Deleuze puts it, eternal return is 'the reproduction and reaffirmation of chance itself. Destiny in the eternal return is also the "welcoming" of chance.'⁸⁵

The Nietzschean concept of eternal recurrence is useful for my consideration of Kierkegaardian forward recollection. The characters of Shakespeare's second tetralogy are portraying people who have already lived their lives; and the actors playing them today are portraying characters who have been portrayed many times before. Each character is being endlessly reincarnated, and each actor can learn from his predecessors. Of course the characters can remember what they are going to do, what is going to happen to them, because their real-life counterpart has already done it, has already had it happen to them. This is where prophecy comes in: the characters in these plays often instinctively 'know' because of the historical past things that have not yet happened or are yet to occur in the future of the play or its successor in the sequence: thus 'predictions are coded in memory.'⁸⁶ This is because

the promise of a historical event is always more than what was actually realised. There is always more in the past than what happened. And so we have to find *the future of the past*, the unfulfilled potential of the past.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ Paul Strathern, *The Essential Nietzsche* (London: Virgin, 1996).

⁸⁵ Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, p. 28.

⁸⁶ Agnes Heller, *The Time is out of Joint: Shakespeare as Philosopher of History* (Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002), p. 128.

⁸⁷ Paul Ricoeur, 'Imagination, Testimony and Trust: A Dialogue with Paul Ricoeur', in *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*, ed. Richard Kearney and Mark Dooley (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 12-7 (p. 14, emphasis in the original).

The characters of the plays, in speaking about events in their own future and that of the plays, are engaged in foreshadowing their own future even though it is past history. Yet what I call forward recollection differs from prophecy or prediction, which can be proved wrong, and is more akin to prolepsis, to actively anticipating what has already transpired.

Mary Carruthers is as sceptical as Aristotle of the idea of forward recollection:

memory remains, by its nature, of the past – a thing cannot be in memory until it is past. This insistence is basic in medieval Aristotelian (and Augustinian) psychology [. . .]. Therefore, to say that memory is the matrix within which humours perceive present and future, is also to say that both present and future, in human time, are mediated by the past.⁸⁸

That, however, is precisely what I am saying: ‘the present and the future [. . .] are mediated by the past.’ The concept of forward recollection can help us to understand Shakespeare’s use of memory in the second tetralogy in a way that memory treatises of his own time cannot. The philosophers and theorists I have cited in this section have all contributed to our understanding of the importance of prolepsis in the plays in relation to memory, and the chapters on the plays that follow will examine instances of prolepsis in them. Moments of forward recollection in the plays often seem to bind characters to an already decided future, to what already exists ahead of them in time. But the audience also bears witness to forward recollection as a mechanism which allows the future to be released from the past, and it is this aspect of forward recollection which makes it such an important feature of the second tetralogy.

Ricoeur’s notion of the ‘unfulfilled potential of the past’ is also discussed by Hugh Grady in an essay devoted to *Hamlet*.⁸⁹ He points out that we can never pin down an absolute meaning for the text because of these shifting historical perspectives. That does not mean that Shakespeare’s plays become a slave to whatever culture reads them, because the truth of the text can still be revealed ‘negatively, in the text’s resistance to certain interpretive schemes.’⁹⁰ But it does mean that the receptivity of the texts to the different times and memories that flow through them confirms their status as ‘art’, art that is not rationally fixed but which is

⁸⁸ Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, pp. 238-9.

⁸⁹ ‘*Hamlet* and the Present: Notes on the Moving Aesthetic “Now”’, in *Presentist Shakespeares*, pp. 141-63.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 142. See also Grady, *Shakespeare, Machiavelli and Montaigne: Power and Subjectivity from Richard II to Hamlet* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 83-4.

'renewable within the flux of time that creates a complex kind of temporality negotiating between past and present.'⁹¹ It was Heidegger who said that art is one of the ways history takes place; that when art takes place, then history begins again.⁹²

Memory and time

We can again go as far back as Aristotle for confirmation that 'all memory involves time.'⁹³ The problem is that the medieval characters of Shakespeare's second tetralogy perceive time in a different way from that of the early modern and modern audiences. These different perceptions of time affect their – and our – perception of the second tetralogy, and the plays' understanding and account of memories. Jacqueline de Romilly has shown that manifold conceptions of time are not new. In *Time in Greek Tragedy*,⁹⁴ she outlines three ways of thinking about time, each of which finds its counterpart, as I will show, in Shakespeare's second tetralogy.

The first type of time is Aeschylean, which is time conceived in ethical terms as bringing justice and retribution for wrongs committed. This type is perfectly illustrated by Hal's soliloquy concluding, 'I'll so offend, to make offence a skill, | Redeeming time when men think least I will' (*1 Henry IV*, 1.2.206). The second type of time is Sophoclean, which is closer to that of Heraclitus, where time is not an agent of justice but a testament to the insecurity of life. Hotspur provides an example from the same play:

O gentlemen, the time of life is short;
To spend that shortness basely were too long
If life did ride upon a dial's point,
Still ending at the arrival of an hour.
(*1 Henry IV*, 5.2.81-4)

The third type of time is Euripidean time, where time is an agent of chance, fortune or fate, to which we all fall victim. Again, Hotspur provides the best example in *1 Henry IV*: 'But thoughts, the slave of life, and life time's fool, | And time, that takes survey of all the world, | Must have a stop' (*1 Henry IV*, 5.4.80-3).

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

⁹² Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1978).

⁹³ Sorabji, *Aristotle on Memory*, 449^b24, p. 48.

⁹⁴ Jacqueline de Romilly, *Time in Greek Tragedy* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1968).

Wylie Sypher suggests four different conceptions of time in Shakespeare.⁹⁵ Firstly, there are Chronicles, which presuppose a closed type of time, which may be more familiar as the Heideggerean 'Umwelt', the ambient physical world in which a succession of events, sequential, linear, annal, or episodic, take place without ulterior significance. Secondly, there is Fortune or Fate, another closed type of time. Like de Romilly's third, Euripidean, type of time, this may be more familiar as Heidegger's 'Mitwelt', a world of togetherness, shared experience and group relations; it is similar to the cyclical idea of the wheel of fortune, 'not only as blind rotation but as an agency of divine governance [. . .]. This cyclical time assumes that there is nothing new in history.'⁹⁶ Thirdly, there is Retribution or Justice, another closed type of time, which is similar to de Romilly's first, Aeschylean, type of time. Again it has some resemblance to the Heideggerean 'Mitwelt', dictating that a 'penalty must befall those who violate the moral law inherent in the cosmos.'⁹⁷ Finally, there is an open type of time, which Sypher calls Psychic Duration. This may be more familiar as Heidegger's 'Eigenwelt', an internal world of subjective perception; an anachronistic mode of time that fuses past, present and future in a private recognition of abiding nature.

There is, in short, no such thing as a single, homogenous sense of time in the plays. Time can be linear, stretching both forwards and backwards; circular, reflecting repeated cycles of events and situations; or a combination of linear and circular, a sort of gyre, which revolves and propels itself forward at the same time. There is a 'fundamental ambivalence at the heart of Renaissance ideas of temporality, whereby its Christian view of time (as linear history versus unmoving eternity) was entwined or crossed with circular, repetitive timing which had agricultural and astrological as well as philosophical dimensions.'⁹⁸ Time, like memory, is varied and complex, as the plays of the second tetralogy attest. As Sypher writes, 'Shakespeare could not rely upon any single conception of the time. His consciousness of the time experience is multiple, the various aspects and forms of this time experience being inherent in play after play.'⁹⁹ That 'the past will recur as the future',¹⁰⁰ as Sypher states, is particularly true of

⁹⁵ Wylie Sypher, *The Ethic of Time: Structures of Experience in Shakespeare* (New York: Seabury Press, 1976).

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁹⁸ Phillipa Berry, 'Between Idolatry and Astrology: Modes of Temporal Repetition in *Romeo and Juliet*', *A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. Dymna Callaghan (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), p. 359.

⁹⁹ Sypher, *The Ethic of Time*, p. x.

the history plays. The desire of Hal and other characters to forge history not least through the control of memory is undermined by the vast timescape that transcends the tetralogy. The Epilogue of *Henry V* warns us that 'history is a triviality when seen against the illimitable horizon of time':¹⁰¹ '*Henry V*, seemingly the most self-contained of the histories, in fact reveals an open-ended structure which forces us to see the history of his reign as a mere episode carved from the continuum of human time.'¹⁰²

Julia Kristeva's notion of 'Women's Time' gives us another way of exploring the complexity of time in the plays.¹⁰³ The key tenet of Kristeva's influential essay is that 'women's time' has two modes: the first cyclical or repetitive, and the second eternal or monumental. Both of these modes of time stand 'in opposition to the linearity of historical time',¹⁰⁴ and their presence in the second tetralogy may offer one way of countering the common complaint that the voices of women are not sufficiently represented in Shakespeare and in his history plays in particular.¹⁰⁵ The plays of the second tetralogy become much richer once we recognise the interplay of different modes of time in them. They rely on the audience's awareness of the diverse perceptions of time through which the characters make sense of past, present and future events, and the diverse memories that are indivisible from them.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. x.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

¹⁰² Northrop Frye, *Fools of Time: Studies in Shakespearean Tragedy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967).

¹⁰³ Originally published as 'Le Temps des Femmes', *Cahiers de recherche de sciences des textes et documents*, 5 (Winter, 1979).

¹⁰⁴ Berry, 'Between Idolatry and Astrology', p. 359.

¹⁰⁵ For example, Virginia Woolf, who commented that 'the history of England is the history of the male line' ('Women and Fiction', in *Granite and Rainbow* [London: Hogarth Press, 1958], p. 76); Graham Holderness: 'few [women] engross the pages of chronicles or historical play-texts, where male speech and actions predominate' (*Shakespeare: The Histories*, [Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000], p. 16); and Phyllis Rackin: 'Renaissance historiography constituted a masculine tradition, written by men, devoted to the deeds of men, glorifying the masculine virtues of courage, honor and patriotism, and dedicated to preserving the names of past heroes and recording their patriarchal genealogies' (*Stages of History, Shakespeare's English Chronicles* [Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990], p. 147).

CHAPTER THREE:
A DRAMA AND A LANGUAGE OF MEMORY

Memory in Drama

Where memory is, theatre is.¹

Drama is a medium especially equipped to explore and examine memory; each of the chapters on the plays of the second tetralogy that follow this chapter include considerations of metadramatic incidents in them, which depend on, reveal, and reflect on memory. So the first section of this chapter asks the question: how can theatre discover, examine, and contain memory? By theatre I mean three things: firstly, the physical building; secondly, theatre as an activity that evinces ‘the need continually to rehearse and renegotiate the relationship with memory and the past’² as a means of working towards understanding that past; and thirdly, the people involved in the performance of a particular production, the actors and the audience. I will now look at each of these aspects of theatre in turn.

Theatre as location

Let us start with the physical building itself as a repository for memory. As Marvin Carlson observes, ‘the physical theatre, as a site of the continuing reinforcement of memory by surrogation, is not surprisingly among the most haunted of human cultural structures.’³ For example, the Globe has gone through two rebirths: when it was destroyed by cannon fire in a performance of *Henry VIII* in 1613, it was rebuilt the following year; it was then demolished in 1644 under pressure from Puritan factions, but rebuilt for our generation in 1997. There are other ‘Globes’ all over the world: six

¹ Herbert Blau, *The Audience* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), p. 47.

² Marvin A. Carlson, *The Haunted Stage: The Theatre As Memory Machine* (Ann Arbor, MI.: University of Michigan Press, 2003), p. 167.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 2. In using the term ‘memory by surrogation’ Carlson leans on the work of Joseph Roach, who sees performance as ‘the doomed search for originals by continuously auditioning stand-ins’ (Roach, *Cities of the Dead* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1996], p. 3).

in the US, three in Germany, and one each in Italy, the Czech Republic, and Japan.⁴ Each of these Globes seeks to remember and memorialise the original Globe as a repository for drama and, indeed, culture. The proliferation of Globes attests to the importance attached to constructing a simulacrum of the original edifice as a storehouse for Shakespeare – if it was not important, a theatre of any design would have been built instead. Place as a site of memory is something we witness again at Shrewsbury and Agincourt in the plays. The new Globes begin, however, from their conception to acquire their own unique histories and memories, which are quite separate and different from those of the original Globe. As Graham Holderness puts it, ‘the New Globe, in its shining paintwork and gleaming steel gates [. . .] announces the irrecoverable absence of its original’;⁵ it reminds us of the original Globe and reminds us that it is not the original Globe. In this way, each Globe is at once a replica *and* an original site for memory. According to Carlson:

For most of the history of the theatre, and in most theatrical cultures, the usefulness of a permanent physical structure answerable to the needs of theatre in general or of a particular type of theatre has meant that the most common of all theatre experiences has involved audiences returning repeatedly to the same physical place or places to see there performances of much the same type created and performed by a continuing group of artists, all of which encourages the operations of ghosting upon reception.⁶

This ‘ghosting’ contributes to the formation of memory. Julie Stone Peters goes so far as to write that:

Shakespeare implicitly identifies the Globe theatre as a space for the performance of classical mnemonics in his characterisation of it as a ‘wooden o’ in which the actors were ‘crooked figures’ who, like the hieroglyphs that served as memory images, could ‘attest in little place a million, [. . .] ciphers to [a] great accompt.’⁷

While I do not read into Shakespeare’s second tetralogy an engagement with the classical art of memory on such an obvious level (bearing in mind that for most of the

⁴ Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper (eds), *Shakespeare’s Globe: A Theatrical Experiment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 234-5.

⁵ Graham Holderness, *Textual Shakespeare: Writing and the Word* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2003), p. 252.

⁶ Carlson, *The Haunted Stage*, p. 162.

⁷ Julie Stone Peters, ‘Theater and Book in the History of Memory: Materializing Mnemosyne in the Age of Print’, *Modern Philology*, 102:2 (Nov., 2004), 179-206 (p. 188). She is quoting *Henry V*, Prologue 13-17.

performances of second tetralogy plays the Globe had not yet been built), it is clear that the theatre was and still is a repository of memories. In Elizabethan England, this was greatly aided by the physical location of the theatre, which in itself affected the audience's reception of Shakespeare's plays. It is more than possible that crossing Tower Bridge, with its impaled heads on spikes, the audience were reminded of the fates that awaited the traitors of the plays; while passing the bear pit next door they may have been reminded of fights;⁸ and the brothels they passed may have brought to mind Mistress Quickly and Doll Tearsheet. Carlson has no doubt that 'The memories and associations of that part of the city help to provide a reception context for any performance seen there.'⁹ These days, Bankside in London on which the New Globe is located is a cultural centre where the Tate Modern art gallery, the National Theatre and the Royal Festival Hall are also located. In this respect the New Globe, quite rightly if we accept that Shakespeare is the 'institution' his plays have turned him into,¹⁰ has secured its memorial association with the great cultural monuments of our generation.

Theatre as activity

Having discussed theatre as location, I now want to write about how memory inheres in theatre as an activity, including the use of physical properties such as costumes and props. In fact, *anything* about a theatrical performance can carry memories which affect its reception and interpretation:

Any physical element (or for that matter any visual or aural element, not only music but also lighting and even sound effects), a setting, a costume, property or item of scenery can be and many have been used in more than one production and thus may carry with them certain memories of their previous usage in a quite different play.¹¹

An Elizabethan example of this would be Henslowe's list of the Admiral's Men's props at the Rose Theatre, which includes, among other things, a rock, a cage, a tomb, a hell's mouth, a bedstead, bells, a beacon, a globe, a golden sceptre, a golden fleece,

⁸ The bear pits are obliquely brought to mind by Lear (3.7.53) and Macbeth (5.7.11-2).

⁹ Carlson, *The Haunted Stage*, p. 140.

¹⁰ Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 12.

¹¹ Carlson, *The Haunted Stage*, p. 119.

tennis rackets, a bay tree, two hatchets, a lion skin, a bear skin, and Neptune's fork and garment.¹² We may well wonder at the use made of some of these things, but it was the costumes, which represented a considerable investment on the part of the company, that were most likely to be used over and over again.¹³ Carlson confirms that

The average European theatre from the Renaissance until the modern era tended to use a basic stock of costumes, settings, and properties for all plays, providing at least potentially a great variety of visual interconnections not necessarily anticipated in the dramatic text.¹⁴

For example, it is possible that a playgoer would have seen the same crown worn by the actors playing Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V.¹⁵ This requires on the part of any audience member who saw more than one of the plays of the second tetralogy a very particular memorial investment, in seeing the plays as parts of the same story despite the gap of years between their initial performances. And this is regardless of the fact that all three kings are quite different in characterisation and idiom, as my chapters on the plays will show.

Modern budgets and the demand for realism have often meant that the creative recycling of theatrical properties usual in the Renaissance era has been lost, and with it the memorial associations that second-hand costumes and props can bring. Modern companies would not generally consider reusing materials or props in such a flagrant way. However, in more recent years,¹⁶ this has begun to change. Indeed, at the New Globe, this practice has been to some extent resumed, and some companies and directors have once again become more receptive to the idea of recycling, aware that the memories evoked by physical things, by the nature of the theatre which is present, if not in flesh and blood then in metal and wood and cloth before us, are something special, and to be encouraged.

¹² Tiffany Stern, *Making Shakespeare: From Stage To Page* (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 97.

¹³ See 'The Circulation of Clothes and the Making of the English Theater', in *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*, ed. Ann Jones and Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 175-206.

¹⁴ Carlson, *The Haunted Stage*, p. 122.

¹⁵ Stage objects are discussed by Arthur F. Kinney in *Shakespeare by Stages: An Historical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 'Equipment', pp. 97-125.

¹⁶ Because romantic, realistic and modern theatrical practices worked in turn to 'stress their difference from absent originals', placing limits on the amount of overt theatrical recycling that was possible. See Carlson, *The Haunted Stage*, p. 167. The demise of these approaches has allowed recycling to resume.

The actor's memory

The early modern theatre required prodigious feats of memory of its actors, who had to learn long stretches of dialogue, often memorising not only one but sometimes two or even three separate parts, along with their cues for entrances and exits.¹⁷ Along with the play currently being performed, they had to hold much of the company's repertoire in their memories, as there were no long runs and in the course of a week two or three different plays might be put on, leaving little time for rehearsal or revision of the parts between performances.¹⁸ If we need contemporary evidence of this skill, we need only turn to John Marston's *The Malcontent*, whose actor, Sly, is prepared to bet on his exceptional powers of recall:

SINCKLO	My cousin here hath an excellent memory indeed, sir.
SLY	Who, I? I tell you a strange thing of myself, and I can tell you, for one that never studied the art of memory 'tis very strange thing too.
CONDELL	What's that, sir?
SLY	Why, I'll lay a hundred pound I'll walk but once by the Goldsmiths' Row in Cheap, take notice of the signs, and tell you them with a breath instantly.

(Induction 98-106)¹⁹

In speaking memorised lines, the actors also reveal the recurring nature of memory. They begin a sequence of recollection: the actor remembers his lines and speaks them, and then these lines are in turn remembered (to a greater or lesser extent) by the audience, and become once more 'reconsigned to the memory for storage.'²⁰

So what happens when the actor's seemingly indefatigable memory fails – when an actor forgets his lines? In some cases, such as with Justice Shallow and Falstaff in *2 Henry IV*, this can be used not only to comic effect but also to point up the text's engagement with memory at this basic level. It is in this way that 'the fallibility of memory is relevant [. . .] not only to the actors of these plays, but to the plays themselves.'²¹ And when an actor playing Gower or Exeter reports the text of *Henry V*

¹⁷ See Tiffany Stern, *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 'Chapter 3: Rehearsal in Shakespeare's Theatre', particularly pp. 52-79.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 56-7.

¹⁹ John Marston, *The Malcontent* [1604] (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), Induction 98-106.

²⁰ Jody Enders, *The Medieval Theater Of Cruelty: Rhetoric, Memory, Violence* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999), p. 117.

²¹ Lois Potter, "'Nobody's Perfect': Actors' Memories and Shakespeare's Plays of the 1590s", *Shakespeare Survey 42: Shakespeare and the Elizabethans* (1990), 85-97 (p. 97).

to a bookseller, but remembers only their own lines accurately, we are left for ever with the 'bad' quarto of the play.²²

Lois Potter contends that 'the histories from *1 Henry IV* on should [. . .] be harder to memorize [for actors] than the earlier ones, because of their greater naturalism, even randomness'.²³ She is referring to the relative absence of rhyme in these plays in comparison to *Richard II*. Her study of English Shakespeare Company actors reveals that 'some roles in the later histories were found particularly difficult' in terms of memorising the parts: 'Falstaff because he speaks prose and [. . .] Pistol because he talks nonsense.'²⁴ Michael Pennington 'suggested tentatively that perhaps Buckingham in *Richard III* was harder for him than *Richard II* because his lines lacked the "bright images"'.²⁵ Indeed, 'imagery was clearly much more important for some actors than for others. However, the fact that colourless and nondescript lines are the hardest ones to remember emerged clearly from the replies of the [. . .] actors.'²⁶ This observation about memory being facilitated above all by language will be developed in the final section of this chapter, which examines how Shakespeare's distinctive use of certain kinds of language produces, engages with and complicates memory in the second tetralogy.

When actors in the playhouse perform the plays of the tetralogy, they are embodying not only characters but also actual historical people, long dead. Consider this well-known quotation from Thomas Nashe, speaking of Talbot in *King Henry VI*:

to thinke that after he had lyne two hundred yeare in his Tomb, he should triumph againe on the Stage, and haue his bones new embalmed with the teares of ten thousand spectators at least, (at severall times) who in the Tragedian that represents his person, imagine they behold him fresh bleeding.²⁷

It is telling that such an embodied memory should 'triumph again on the stage' specifically, since the stage is a metonym for the theatre, and by extension, its medium, drama. Here, history has been reanimated by Shakespeare's play, but it is

²² Stern, *Making Shakespeare*, p. 125.

²³ Potter, "'Nobody's Perfect'", p. 97.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

²⁷ Thomas Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Divell* [1592], in *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. Ronald B. McKerrow (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966), vol. 1, p. 212.

the actors, 'the Tragedian[s]' who are in immediate control of creating characters, 'represent[ing]' their persons, drawing on their own memories in order to create ours so that we 'imagine' we behold them again even after the space of two centuries: 'because the memories of characters are being publicly performed they fall into public memory'.²⁸ That word 'imagine' is significant: in my chapter on *Henry V* I explain the importance of the audience's imagination for releasing the latent possibilities of the memories the play contains. To return to the quotation, Lina Perkins Wilder has suggested that through this 'triumph' and others, Shakespeare's drama becomes the 'focus and symbol of collective memory'²⁹ – always bearing in mind the definition of 'collective memory' I formulated in Chapter 2, as individual memories which have been combined in such a way that their uniqueness and flexibility are not sacrificed.

One way of perceiving the phenomenon of actors representing the dead on stage would be to see it as a consoling theatre of memory for the audience, who had lost many of their theatrical Catholic mourning rituals for the dead, such as the Requiem Mass, with the advent of the Church of England.³⁰ Hester Lee-Jeffries asserts that 'the staged narrative of national history to some extent took the place of the religious and community rituals of the Catholic past as a force for community identity and cohesion.'³¹ Indeed, the way the actors treat their characters is revealing – do they treat them as fictional, Shakespeare's invention, or as factual, drawn from the sources? Resurrecting bodies on stage was quite common in plays of the age, as Shakespeare's Roman histories and tragedies attest. This practise is particularly noteworthy in the second tetralogy when compared to the first tetralogy; the former has a notable absence of actual ghosts, compared to the latter, which presents them often: '*Richard III* has more ghosts than any other of Shakespeare's plays.'³² The portrayal of the dead on stage called attention to itself, especially when the dead person reminded the audience (or the censor) of a person who was alive, as the furore about the

²⁸ Lina Perkins Wilder, *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre: Recollection, Properties, and Character* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 73.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

³⁰ See, for example, Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002), particularly 'Boundary Disputes', pp. 244-8. Of course, there is the argument that this 'too rigidly aligns Catholic practise with memory and protestant reforms with oblivion.' See Isabel Karremann, 'Rites of Oblivion in Shakespearean History Plays', *Shakespeare Survey 63: Shakespeare's English Histories and their Afterlives* (2010), 24-36 (p. 26).

³¹ Hester Lee-Jeffries, *Shakespeare and Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 78.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 79.

performance of *Richard II* on the eve of Essex's failed coup,³³ and the cutting of the deposition scene from the early quartos,³⁴ testify. In this case the dead Richard II was supposed to remind people of the living Elizabeth I, and incite them to rebellion. In that respect the authorities were right to be concerned, for there is something unique about the history plays, which portray actual people from England's actual past; we need to think about them differently from the way we think about 'merely' fictional characters because they become, in Ricoeur's phrase, 'rival historians, struggling for possession of the "true" interpretation of the past',³⁵ and 'the historian's function is to insist that there are always exceptions.'³⁶ The actors represent the characters in this struggle between fiction and fact.

Actors also have to struggle with (or against) the memory of actors who have come before them. Consider this quotation from Douglas Bruster. He is writing about actors who are playing Hamlet and who are speaking the soliloquy beginning 'To be or not to be'. But his observations can be extended to the 'anxiety of influence' suffered by many actors:

Even as [actors] deliver their lines to unseen audiences, many of [them] peek at the actors who have come before them. Although they cannot avoid adding their own style to the performance, each tries to do what his predecessors have done. [. . .]As the decades pass, the differences among them increase.[. . .] [T]hey still pay attention to those who have started before them, but instead of imitating their predecessors these actors strive to be slightly different. [. . .] [I]f the earliest actors had glanced at their counterparts while speaking, these latest [actors] strike you as looking almost wildly around them. [. . .] [T]hey seem intimidated by the number of speakers who have come before. Their response is fairly uniform. These [actors] struggle to be different. [. . .] [T]hey change their gestures and the cadences of their lines, delivering them in slightly improbable postures as though trying to prevent you from imitating them or predicting their action.³⁷

Bruster acknowledges the increasing pressure on actors to do something different with a part after centuries of accumulated memory; he observes that early actors were not

³³ The Queen complained to William Lambarde in 1601: 'I am Richard II. Know ye not that?'

³⁴ 4.1.155-318 was cut from printed editions of the play. Presumably, Shakespeare's printers were compelled to cut it by the censor, because he considered it incendiary at a time when the Queen of England, with no heir, was nearing the end of her life. In 1608, printers reinstated it in Q4, albeit in a somewhat garbled form. It finally appeared more legibly in the Folio of 1623.

³⁵ Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004), p. 35.

³⁶ J. G. A. Pocock, 'The Politics of History: The Subaltern and the Subversive,' *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 6 (1998), 219-34 (p. 229).

³⁷ Douglas Bruster, *To Be Or Not To Be* (London: Continuum, 2007), pp. 2-4.

as nervous about their portrayals as those who have performed most recently, not least because early modern theatre had a certain way of performing particular roles which was passed to the next generation of actors via what we might understand as apprenticeships.³⁸ Finding a new way to play Hamlet – or indeed, Richard II, Hal, or Falstaff – after over four hundred years of productions is not easy. Nevertheless, the actors usually rely on their own and their audience's memory of what has come before to differentiate themselves from their precursors. It is precisely the richness of Shakespeare's work that allows different portrayals of characters to keep appearing. Audiences never seem to tire of seeing *Hamlet* – or indeed, *Richard II* – however many memories they possess of previous performances of the same play. This is not a little to do with the language and the plots of the plays, of course – but it is also to do with seeing new actors give different portrayals, in the context of a relationship between actor and audience which is reliant on memories of previous productions.

Added to this is the fact that an actor carries the memory of his previous roles with him: his body, when recognised by the audience, becomes the bearer of complex semiotic images that point to his previous roles. The audience's interpretation of the play currently before them will be affected by the comparisons they draw with the actors' previous roles. For example, when David Tennant played Hamlet he was better known by audiences as the BBC TV character Doctor Who,³⁹ and when Ellie Kendrick played Juliet she was better known for her role in a dramatisation of the life of Anne Frank.⁴⁰ Both these productions would have demanded a considerable effort on the part of the audience to distance themselves from the actors' previous incarnations, though in Kendrick's case the ultimate fates of Anne Frank and Juliet may have helped rather than hindered her case; indeed, it may have contributed to the reason she was cast as Juliet in the first place. Lee-Jeffries remarks that:

Audiences are now sometimes very definitely meant to remember where they last saw that actor, and the contemporary theatre has returned to a practise

³⁸ See Tiffany Stern, *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 67ff.

³⁹ David Tennant in the Royal Shakespeare Company's production of *Hamlet* at The Courtyard Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon from 24th July 2008 to 15th November 2008.

⁴⁰ Ellie Kendrick in Shakespeare's Globe production of *Romeo and Juliet* from 1st May to 29th August 2009. Kendrick had previously played Anne Frank in the BBC television series *The Diary of Anne Frank*, which ran from 5th January 2009 for five weeks, and was repeated on HD channels until 14th October 2009. Kendrick's previous incarnation as Anne Frank was not missed by reviewers Michael Coveney in *The Independent* and Charles Spencer in *The Telegraph*.

that Shakespeare would have regarded as natural and essential, an integral part of the complicity that he solicits from the audience.⁴¹

So the audience has a great deal of power when it comes to deciding how to receive and interpret the characters before them, however well (or badly) they are portrayed on stage. The audience preserves the memory of the event as it was performed before them, and it is the audience's memory that I now wish to discuss in more detail.

The audience's memory

Drama is a medium which by definition presupposes performances which are received by many people at once. Unlike the novel, which is normally addressed to only one reader at a time, drama is predicated on the presence of an audience. It is important, however, to stress the dual nature of the audience: at the same time as being a group, it is made up of individuals. Two members of an audience coming away from the same production will recall different aspects of it or the same aspects in different ways, though they may both remember broadly the same incidents or facts, such as when an actor forgot his lines or where the performance was held. So they remember collectively and individually *at the same time*. Consequently, though we might think of the 'audience' as a singular mass, it is important to take their individual responses into account when considering what memories are brought to and taken away from the plays. Although the audience has already been mentioned in Chapter Two, which discussed the phenomenology of the audience's memory, I want to focus more narrowly here on what memories the audience brings to a play. The memorability of any scene depends in no small part on how personally involved the audience is. If the history created by Shakespeare is to survive in the popular imagination, the audience's memory is vitally important. The audience is not just a passive recipient of the history portrayed before them, but actively involved in the memorial process which goes into its survival. Like the actors playing characters on stage who enact a past and thus remember it in the present, the audience have the power to help re-create this history, too.

In other words, for Shakespeare's history to become viable, the audience must play a role in retaining it: 'Shakespeare [. . .] was unconcerned about seeing

⁴¹ Lee-Jeffries, *Shakespeare and Memory*, p. 84.

“authorized” versions of his plays in print because he knew that their “authority” was bestowed upon them by their ever-changing articulation in performance’,⁴² performances retained in the memories of the audience. It is not irrelevant to remember that ‘author’ has the same root in Latin as ‘authority’;⁴³ yet ‘an “author” acquires “authority” only by virtue of having his works retained “sententialiter” in the memories of subsequent generations’.⁴⁴

Another Latin root, this time for ‘text’, which comes from *textus* meaning ‘to weave’, hints at the ‘weaving’ that takes place for a text to become an accepted work of literature. As Mary Carruthers explains: ‘literary works become institutions as they weave a community together by providing it with shared experience and a certain kind of language, the language of stories that can be experienced over and over again through time and as occasion suggests.’⁴⁵ Shakespeare is the case in point of this observation. His authority has come not only from himself as an author but also from the texts themselves, which have attained that authority by becoming, to use Carruthers’s word, ‘institutions’.

Since the audience is so important in Shakespeare’s creation of history through memory in the plays, it also becomes important to think about how much Shakespeare’s original audience knew of their own history: because if they knew their history from some other source or sources, they would bring the memory of that history with them to the plays, and that would colour how they responded to them. In so far as the audience already knew the events and characters of the plays from previous accounts, these accounts would have shaped their perceptions of and assumptions about these events and characters. In which case, Shakespeare had to work to make plausible and memorable his own version of that history. In so far as the audience knew nothing about the events and characters of the period covered by the plays, Shakespeare would have had much more room to create fresh memories for them of their nation’s history. He can create that history for them: he can forge his own version, with all its complications, as the version that stays with the audience in their living memory. Throughout the plays, Shakespeare must address both these

⁴² Simon Trussler, *Will’s Will: The Last Wishes of William Shakespeare* (Richmond: The National Archives, 2007), p. 110.

⁴³ See M. D. Chenu, ‘Auctor, actor, autor’, *Bulletin du Cange* 3 (1927), pp. 81-6. My sincere thanks to David Warren for translating this into English for me.

⁴⁴ Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p. 190.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

audiences simultaneously: 'These are moments when the play openly wishes to bring together those who had not read the chronicles and those who already had knowledge of them.'⁴⁶ The most obvious appeal is that of the Chorus in *Henry V*:

Vouchsafe to those that have not read the story
That I may prompt them, and of such as have,
I humbly pray them to admit th'excuse
Of time, of numbers, and due course of things
Which cannot in their huge and proper life
Be here presented.

(5.0.1-6)

Before I consider which memories the audience may have brought to bear on the plays, it is important to remember that the memories Shakespeare's original audience brought to bear on the plays were obviously different from those a modern audience brings to bear on them. With that proviso in mind, I want to look now at three different sorts of memory either of those audiences might bring to bear on a play: the memory of other historical narratives and sources, the memory of genre, and the memory of the first tetralogy.

The memory of other narratives and sources

It is likely that some of Shakespeare's original audience, particularly the literate ones, would have known that Shakespeare was retelling the story of the period of history that the second tetralogy covers using a selection of material from his sources. But what about the rest of his audience – those who 'either could not afford to buy [the sources], could not borrow or get access to them, or simply could not read?'⁴⁷ Could they have brought the memory of the history played before them from some other source? The short answer is that it is likely that the most of them would have, because the meaning of the word 'history' itself is fluid: 'history' can come in the form of something as innocuous as other plays and ballads. As I noted in Chapter One, the word 'history' has its origin in the Greek word *ἵστορία*, meaning 'inquiry', but it passed into Latin as *historia*, meaning 'narrative'. Thus, as David Scott Kastan points out, 'the word has etymological connections with the subject, the method, and the product of

⁴⁶ Jean-Christophe Mayer, 'The Decline of the Chronicle and Shakespeare's History Plays', *Shakespeare Survey 63: Shakespeare's English Histories and their Afterlives* (2010), 12-23 (p. 13).

⁴⁷ Mayer, 'The Decline of the Chronicle and Shakespeare's History Plays', p. 16.

the study of man in time.⁴⁸ Indeed, 'history' was such an unstable term in the Renaissance that it was used to describe a variety of texts, including 'poems, plays, memorials, biographies, narratives of current events, political narratives, annals, chronicles, surveys, [and] Antiquarian accounts.'⁴⁹ In fact,

it is an accepted critical commonplace that many more (especially Londoners) would have gotten their 'history' from historical dramas by Shakespeare [. . .] and others rather than from proper historical texts [. . .] one has to assume, therefore, that Englishmen and women, with some exceptions, were not in a position to evaluate critically the historical knowledge they received.'⁵⁰

If we need contemporary evidence of such a practice, consider this exchange from Ben Jonson's *The Devil is an Ass*:

FITZDOTTEREL	Thomas of Woodstock, I'm sure, was Duke, and he was made away At Calais; as was Duke Humphrey at Bury; And Richard the third, you know what end he came to.
MERECRAFT	By my'faith you are cunning i'the-chronicle, sir.
FITZDOTTEREL	No, I confess, I ha't from the play-books, And think they're more authentic.
ENGINE	That's sure, sir.

(2.4.8-14)⁵¹

Clearly, the exchange is meant to be humorous, but it does reflect the idea that people could and did get their history from play-books, and by extension the performances themselves. D. R. Woolf writes that 'prior to 1600, and perhaps even a century later, most people would have heard their history in one form or another long before they read it, if they ever read it at all.'⁵² And in *Shakespeare's Sense of History*, Michael

⁴⁸ David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time* (Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New Hampshire, 1982), p. 12.

⁴⁹ Ivo Kamps, 'The Writing of History in Shakespeare's England', in *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works Vol. II: The Histories*, ed. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), p. 8. Mayer makes a similar point: 'while the chronicle could appeal to only a fairly restricted market of well-to-do buyers, shorter political histories, biographies, books of commonplaces on history, historical ballads, topical pamphlets, newsbooks as well as history plays (also marketed as playbooks) would gradually appeal to an increasingly wide spectrum of the population' (Jean-Christophe Mayer, 'The Decline of the Chronicle and Shakespeare's History Plays', p. 13).

⁵⁰ Kamps, 'The Writing of History in Shakespeare's England', p. 5.

⁵¹ Ben Jonson, *The Devil is an Ass and Other Plays*, ed. M. J. Kidnie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

⁵² D. R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 83.

Ward argues that early modern drama was accepted by early modern audiences as legitimate historiography:

the modern concept of history as a discipline in its own right with its own proper questions and own methods of answering those questions was alien to Renaissance Englishmen. Their idea of a historian was much less restrictive than ours, and consisted of anyone dealing with historical material or questions about history in any field or literary genre – even drama.⁵³

In summary, it seems that, literate or illiterate, all but the youngest of Shakespeare's original audience would have known the history portrayed before them in some way, from some other 'source', however widely that term is conceived. This poses an important question: how does the play generate interest in its plot if the audience already remembers the story? This is applicable to the other plays of the canon as well,⁵⁴ but the history plays pose with particular urgency the question of how to find interest in familiar content, because their subject matter is so well chronicled. Part of the answer to this question lies in the changes Shakespeare made to his sources, and to his characters, which allowed multiple memories to occur in the plays through the reminiscences of characters as diverse as Falstaff and Quickly and Hal: 'in a kind of paradox, the author uses a familiar story to emphasise the originality of his contribution.'⁵⁵ Another part of the answer is in *how* Shakespeare tells his stories: 'One of the most important effects of drama's recycling of material is that it encourages audiences to compare varying versions of the same stories, leading them to pay more attention to how the story is told and less to the story itself.'⁵⁶ It is this which justifies my concentration on *how* Shakespeare produces history from memories.

What Shakespeare no doubt recognised through his engagement with diverse sources was the competing claims of different historical narratives, which helped him realise the constructed nature of history.⁵⁷ This is a recognition which, as his audience, we also cannot escape, since it is written into the plays. Take Richard II's acknowledgment of history's fictional status, which is implicit in his words to his wife:

⁵³ Michael J. Ward, *Shakespeare's Sense of History* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oregon, 1999), p. 2.

⁵⁴ Apart from the three plays that are generally agreed not to be indebted to a previous text for their main plot and principal characters: *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Love's Labour's Lost* and *The Tempest*.

⁵⁵ Carlson, *The Haunted Stage*, p. 27.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁵⁷ See Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).

'In winter's tedious nights sit by the fire | With good old folks, and let them tell thee tales | Of woeful ages long ago betid' (5.1.40-2). The challenge for Shakespeare was to find a way of fusing the different histories available to him and to his audience into a coherent story of his own, which would then be remembered by the audience.

The ethical implication of history-as-story is that the truth of what is written comes into question, because it is shown to be only one of many competing narratives. Throughout the chapters on the plays I will highlight points where the plays actively encourage a healthy scepticism about the version of history that they or their characters present and portray through memories. For Shakespeare, writing under the constraints of state censorship, under a monarch whose ancestors were the victors being written about, the plays' memories must have had to seem, at least overtly, to be in keeping with the approved accounts of the past; but between the lines lay alternative visions of the past, which harboured in turn alternative possibilities for the future.⁵⁸ By the close of *Richard II*, history is written by the victors (4.1.222-27), but Bolingbroke's memories of his crimes (3.1.5-8) mean that Richard's innocence – an alternative story – is kept at the forefront of the plays' concerns. Henry IV knows that alternative verdicts on the justness of his past actions have led to civil war, and will dictate the future fate of his reign. There is more than one potential outcome for the battle of Shrewsbury; only one will come to pass, but all the potential outcomes have been engendered by other interpretations of the past. Henry V senses something similar on the eve of Agincourt: for Henry, how the murder of Richard II is remembered will affect the future outcome of the battle (*Henry V*, 4.1.286-91). These alternative memories ensure that the audience are acutely aware of how easily things might have turned out otherwise and how different history might have been.

The memory of genre

The second memory that may have been brought to the plays is the memory of other plays of the same type or genre, in this case, the notion of a 'history play'. For modern audiences, it can be argued that when they go to see a play their knowledge or expectations of the genre of the play gives them some clue as to its themes and style.

⁵⁸ This is reminiscent of Benjamin's 'chips of messianic time'. Benjamin shows how flashes of messianic time in the past connect to potentialities for the future. See Walter Benjamin, 'On the Concept of History', in *Selected Writings: Volume 4, 1938-1940*, ed. Marcus Paul Bullock and Gary Smith (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1996), pp. 389-400.

Genre clues us in to the outcome of the play, even if we are ignorant of the play's plot to begin with. This knowledge of genre need not be academic; our understanding of the genres of comedy, tragedy, history, romance, or 'problem comedy' can be gathered by repeated readings or viewings of such plays. However, in the case of Shakespeare's original audience, as Paulina Kewes and others have argued,⁵⁹ they would not necessarily have conceived of the 'genre' of 'history play' as we do; perhaps they would not even have understood it as a concept, despite the plethora of plays dealing with English history between 1590 and 1600.

Yet clearly at least some of Shakespeare's audience had some idea of what we would call genre; if they did not, Polonius's joke to Hamlet about the different types of plays - 'tragedy, comedy, history, pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical, tragical-comical-historical-pastoral' (2.2.392-95)⁶⁰ - would be meaningless. But as C. Moseley has observed, 'lumping the plays together, as we tend to do as "histories", may be convenient, but it skates over some real difficulties in that they are self-evidently not all the same in style or in treatment of their historical material.'⁶¹ Thus, *Richard II*, dealing with the fall of a great man, was tragic as defined by Chaucer;⁶² Falstaff was clearly comical; *Henry V* was an epic 'deeply concerned with the values and ideals of a whole nation [. . .] relevant [. . .] to their own political framework.'⁶³ Writing in 1598, Francis Meres described *Richard II* and *Henry IV* as tragedies.⁶⁴ So, as far as the contemporary Shakespearean audience bringing memories to the play is concerned, if we can include their memory of the genre of history play, it is only very tentatively.

The memory of the first tetralogy

The third memory that may have been brought to the plays by some of the audience is that of other Shakespeare's plays that preceded the second tetralogy. The most relevant of these would have been the first tetralogy. In all the plays of the second tetralogy, but more so in *Richard II*, which has no prequels within the second tetralogy,

⁵⁹ Paulina Kewes, 'The Elizabethan History Play: A True Genre?', in *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works Vol. II: The Histories*, ed. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 170-93.

⁶⁰ William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. Harold Jenkins (London: Thomson Learning, 2000).

⁶¹ C. W. R. D. Moseley, *Shakespeare's History Plays: Richard II to Henry V: The Making of a King* (London: Penguin Books, 1988), p. 82.

⁶² *The Canterbury Tales*, 7.1973-7; 3.3163-7.

⁶³ Moseley, *Shakespeare's History Plays*, pp. 96-7.

⁶⁴ Francis Meres, *Palladis Tamia Wits Treasury* (London: Cuthbert Burbie, 1598).

we are confronted with the spectre of the first tetralogy, written earlier yet portraying events after the time of *Richard II*. *Richard II* thus has the task of retrospectively kick-starting the explanation of the causes of the War of the Roses depicted in the first tetralogy. But we must admit, and Shakespeare would have been well aware, that many of his audience would not necessarily have any memories of the first tetralogy. I have argued above that most members of the audience would have known the history portrayed in the second tetralogy from some other source, and Hugh Grady suggests that all would have known the history dramatized in the first tetralogy: 'every English viewer of this play knew that Bolingbrook's personal triumph of Machiavellian political skill would prove a prelude to a destructive cycle of further political intrigue, bloodshed, and civil war'.⁶⁵ I agree that *some* or even *most* of the audience members would have known of the 'destructive cycle of [. . .] civil war'⁶⁶ that followed *Richard II*, or indeed any of the plays of the second tetralogy, particularly if they had seen the first tetralogy, but probably not 'every English viewer of this play'.

In a similar way, both E. M. W. Tillyard and A. P. Rossiter insist that *Richard II* would not have made sense without some knowledge of the anonymous *Woodstock*, which portrays events prior to *Richard II*;⁶⁷ but this is not borne out by the plays, because Shakespeare economically builds any relevant or necessary prehistory of the play – memories that would help the audience's understanding of it – into its dialogue. The second scene of the play, for example, consists largely of memories of events previous to it. Where Shakespeare does not make the prehistory clear, for example in the first scene of the play, any confusion experienced by the audience is deployed as a deliberate dramatic strategy, so that the audience shares in the misperceptions, misunderstandings, and urgent need for resolution that the characters experience.

Clearly, memories of the first tetralogy are not vital for a spectator watching any of the plays of the second tetralogy. They stand on their own, as well as comprising a cycle and constituting components of two cycles. But for those in the

⁶⁵ Hugh Grady, *Shakespeare, Machiavelli, and Montaigne: Power and Subjectivity from Richard II to Hamlet* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 78-9.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁶⁷ Rossiter in 'Richard II', *Angels with Horns*, ed. Graham Storey (NY: Theatre Arts Books, 1961), pp. 23-39, and Tillyard in *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1974). It has recently been conjectured that *Woodstock* was written by Shakespeare: see Michael Egan, 'Woodstock's Golden Metamorphosis', in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (London: Edwin Mellen Press, 2007), pp. 75-116. Egan's edition of *Woodstock* (London: Edwin Mellen Press, 2006) also plumps for Shakespeare as the author. My thanks to Dr. Peter Kirwan of Warwick University for his help on this topic.

audience who *do* know the first tetralogy, how, if at all, does that memory benefit them? I think the answer is that another layer of understanding is achieved – an awareness of echoes or prolepses which become obvious only on a subsequent encounter with of the play. In *Richard II* ‘Shakespeare seized on the opportunity to dramatize the original mythic cause of the disasters already staged in the *Henry VI-Richard III* sequence’.⁶⁸ The characters of the second tetralogy cannot escape the past, even if they want to, because it is determining their actions in the dramatised present; in the same way they cannot escape the end-point to which their actions are propelling them, because it is a history which has already been written in the first tetralogy. The tale of the tetralogy is publicized for the audience by Richard: ‘For God’s sake let us sit upon the ground | And tell sad stories of the death of kings – | How some have been deposed, some slain in war, | Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed’ (3.2.155-57). Paul Budra has argued that Richard II fashions himself within the providential pattern of *de casibus* tradition: ‘the “sad stories” in which Kings die tragically.’⁶⁹ And so it is that ‘the self is formed by the constraints of history: its own self-awareness of history predetermines its fate.’⁷⁰ Clearly Budra is referring to a self-awareness of past history, which in the play’s terms means events in Richard’s past; but the quotation works equally if we take it to mean all history, which includes the history already written in the first tetralogy but still in Richard’s future. And thus Richard’s fate, in the *de casibus* tradition, is determined by the past; and for the audience, who know the first tetralogy, it is determined equally by the future.

Shakespeare does not necessarily involve himself in what we would call generic considerations, but he does make calculated changes to his sources and rewrites a version of history, working into the plays of the second tetralogy any memories he thinks the audience might need from history prior to the opening point of *Richard II*. Likewise, he does not rely on the audience’s memories of the first tetralogy, but those who have them may view the plays in a different light. However conjectural these memories – of genre, of sources, or of the first tetralogy – remain, they cannot be entirely ignored, because they can affect the reception and interpretation of the plays.

⁶⁸ Forker, *Richard II*, p. 3.

⁶⁹ Alison Findlay, ‘“Good sometimes Queen”: *Richard II*, Mary Stuart and the Poetics of Queenship’, in Dermot Cavanagh, Stuart Hampton-Reeves and Stephen Longstaffe (eds), *Shakespeare’s Histories and Counter-Histories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 62-84 (p. 68).

⁷⁰ Paul Budra, ‘Writing the Tragic Self: Richard II’s Sad Stories’, *Renaissance and Reformation*, 18 (1994), 5-15 (p. 14).

The audience may come to the play with their own memories and experiences, already aware of the history played out before them, but Shakespeare never assumes any previous knowledge, and it is my contention that he reveals and multiplies for the audience memories of those times and places and people portrayed in the second tetralogy. This leads me on to my next section, in which I want to make the case for Shakespeare employing drama as the vehicle for his own unique take on a history made from memories.

Shakespeare the Historian

For those of us who know the second tetralogy, both contemporary and modern audiences, Shakespeare is an historian of the events of the period which the plays cover, from 1398 to 1420: 'he became, himself, a "source" for English readers' knowledge about English history'.⁷¹ From this perspective, he is not only a curator but a creator of that history for his audience. Moreover, in actively re-writing history Shakespeare re-makes history; he becomes the *fons et origo* of the history set before the audience. So he takes on the role of historian, but through the variety of voices he allows to tell their tales of those times, he presents not one but many versions of that history.

What did Shakespeare need to do to make his 'play-books' serve as a form of history? Mayer argues that 'Chronicles were bought more by collectors and they were increasingly used as reference books',⁷² so Shakespeare conceivably started by reading the chronicles and annals in the libraries of his patron(s). As Kamps observes, although Shakespeare and other playwrights like him would have 'read the historical texts available to them with considerable care,' they always had, or had to have, 'an eye to how history might be transformed into a profitable commodity for the theatre.'⁷³ They had a feel for what was dramatically exciting, of what would please the crowds, and 'Peter Blayney's list of play-book best sellers for the period 1583-1642 reveals that history plays sold well.'⁷⁴ On that list are three of Shakespeare's histories plays: *1 Henry IV* (seven editions), *Richard II* (five editions) and *Richard III* (five editions). Their

⁷¹ Christy Desmet, 'Shakespeare the Historian', *Shakespeare Survey 63: Shakespeare's English Histories and their Afterlives* (2010), 1-11 (p. 5).

⁷² Mayer, 'The Decline of the Chronicle and Shakespeare's History Plays', p. 13.

⁷³ Kamps, 'The Writing of History in Shakespeare's England', p. 6.

⁷⁴ Mayer, 'The Decline of the Chronicle and Shakespeare's History Plays', p. 13.

popularity in print must reflect at least in part their popularity when performed. Yet again, in making changes to his sources Shakespeare would have become 'more acutely aware than most historians of the apparent contradictions and inconsistencies in the various historical methods that all purported to yield a true and accurate account of the past.'⁷⁵ Shakespeare's plays bear witness to his awareness that he was consciously taking on the mantle of another 'historian', however that was understood at the time, as well as the mantles of 'playwright', 'player' or 'Chamberlain's man'.

Yet perhaps calling Shakespeare a historian is too simplistic. We need to refine that label to give full credence to what he achieves in his history plays. Agnes Heller writes that:

in Shakespeare, one does not need the historian, for actions present themselves through the words and minds of the actors. Shakespeare is not just a chronicler; he is not just a person who eternalizes the great deeds that should be kept in remembrance. He does more than this: he presents the thing itself.⁷⁶

By 'the thing itself' I take Heller to mean an authentic experience of these historical events; certainly that would confirm the feeling that Shakespeare is 'not just [another] chronicler'. Scott Kastan argues something similar:

There is a sense in which the 'play-books' indeed have an authenticity that the chronicles lack – an authenticity deriving from the ability of the drama, through its radical temporality, to present an image of the radical temporality of human existence. The chronicles are able merely to record historical events selectively; the drama is able to attempt a mimesis of the process, or at least the putative process, of history itself.⁷⁷

'[T]he thing itself'; 'history itself'; these are the things that Shakespeare presents before us in the second tetralogy. For both these critics, as for me, the form of the drama has everything to do with the power of the history presented, as this chapter has argued. Indeed, Scott Kastan concludes that 'the shapes of the plays reflect conceptions of the shape of history itself.'⁷⁸ I would add that the form of the drama also empowers memories to present that history to us in a uniquely democratic, ethical, and exciting way. Indeed, Sir Philip Sidney argues in *The Defence of Poesy* for

⁷⁵ Kamps, 'The Writing of History in Shakespeare's England', p. 22.

⁷⁶ Agnes Heller, *The time is out of joint: Shakespeare as Philosopher of History* (Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002), p. 101.

⁷⁷ Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time*, p. 3.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

the ability of 'poesy' to overcome the shortcomings of history, since 'the historian, wanting the precept, is so tied not to what should be but to what is.'⁷⁹ History finds a superior embodiment in dramatic form, because it is realised through the complex connection between memory and theatre which I have outlined above.

As the remaining chapters of this thesis will show, Shakespeare makes history from memories: both his characters' memories and his audience's memories; and that history, made from memories, is altogether more fluid and diverse than that found in his sources. A history made from memories is a history redefined. In doing this, it is unsurprising that 'Shakespeare occupies an institutional position as a repository of memory.'⁸⁰ I am not denying the crucial role of the chronicles - Annabel Patterson has convincingly argued for the polyphony of *Holinshed's Chronicles*, for example⁸¹ - but I do contend that Shakespeare subsumes them in his plays, making them largely redundant for his audience by giving them 'the thing itself.' As Edmund Spenser observed: 'the Methode of a Poet historical is not such, as of an Historiographer. For an Historiographer discourseth of affayres orderly as they were donne [. . .] but a Poet thrusteth into the midstest'.⁸² Mayer is convinced that 'In the 1590s the Chronicle was commercially on the wane',⁸³ and even if he did not perceive it, Shakespeare filled this gap, but replaced it with something somewhat different by 'thrust[ing] into the midstest'.

How does the Language of the Plays Disclose Memories?

It is true that the audience, many of them oral rather than literate, were trained, as we are not, to listen to long, structural discourses, and must have been rather good at it, with better memories than we can boast.⁸⁴

⁷⁹ Philip Sidney, *The Defence of Poesy and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Gavin Alexander (London: Penguin, 2004), p. 16.

⁸⁰ Anthony B. Dawson, 'The Arithmetic of Memory: Shakespeare's Theatre and the National Past', *Shakespeare Survey 52: Shakespeare and the Globe* (1999), 54-67 (p. 63).

⁸¹ Annabel Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994). Patterson makes the case for a wide readership of the *Chronicles* in 'Rethinking Tudor Historiography', *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 92 (1993), 185-208 (pp. 205-6), but I would argue that with cheaper and more readily available alternative sources of the 'same' history, she may be somewhat overstating her case.

⁸² Edmund Spenser, 'The Letter to Raleigh (A Letter of the Authors expounding his whole intention in the course of this worke...)', in *The Faerie Queene, Book 1*, ed. and intro. Carol V. Kaske (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2006), pp. 205-8 (p. 207).

⁸³ Mayer, 'The Decline of the Chronicle and Shakespeare's History Plays', p. 12.

⁸⁴ Frank Kermode, *Shakespeare's Language* (London and New York: Penguin, 2000), p. 4.

A central argument of my thesis is that the language of the plays manufactures and discloses memory. Though this is the case for each character and during every event, the chapters on the plays take one or two key speeches and characters as a way to enquire deeply, via close reading, into the different aspects of language and what they achieve.

In the chapter on *Richard II* I consider the characters' verse, which often allows a multiplicity of interpretations due to the punning equivocation of the characters' choice of words. The numerous readings mirror the way memories can be manifold and even misleading, and can also be manipulated through misremembering. The characters' speech betrays their all too often distorted remembrance of Richard, while his own language shows that he is unable to forget his own existence as king.

In the chapter on *1 Henry IV* Falstaff's prose offers an alternative to the constraints of the courtly blank verse and rhyme of the previous play. I argue that Falstaff's fictionality⁸⁵ leaves him unfettered, despite his size, by history's expectations and the audiences' memories. Falstaff's kinetic prose comes to define our memories of him. Indeed, Brian Vickers believes that Shakespeare creates Falstaff 'primarily through the words he [Falstaff] speaks.'⁸⁶ Through its contrast with the court's use of verse, Falstaff's prose offers another direction for the language of the tetralogy.

In the chapter on *2 Henry IV* I comment on Justice Shallow's speech, and his 'suggestions of sense in non-sense.'⁸⁷ Justice Shallow's frequently repeated phrases are renowned for being shamelessly nostalgic, and often ridiculous, but in a way that is essential to his personality and conception of life. Through this essentially comic figure, Shakespeare points out the actors' reliance and dependence on memory for their own art, a memory which can be misleading even for the possessor of the memory. As will be explained more fully in the chapter, the staged competition between Falstaff and Shallow demonstrates the multimodal nature of the memory of essentially similar events. As the actors talk over each other, it appears that they have learnt different scripts, whereas in actuality the language itself misinforms them and leads to their mistaken cue entries.

⁸⁵ I am discounting his identification as the Puritan martyr Oldcastle for reasons explained in the chapter on *2 Henry IV*.

⁸⁶ Brian Vickers, *The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose* (London: Methuen, 1968), p. 90.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

Finally, in the chapter on *Henry V*, I focus attention on the verse of the Chorus and of Henry's famous speech at Agincourt. Leonard Dean argues that chroniclers attempted to insert into their treatises a didactic message by embellishing them with rhetorical set-pieces, which they hoped would have an emotional effect on the reader.⁸⁸ Indeed, we can see speeches which seem like rhetorical set-pieces throughout the second tetralogy, in the speeches of Richard in the throne room, of Bolingbroke on his death bed, and of Hal at Harfleur and Agincourt. Certainly the language is powerful and affecting. Through a close reading of Henry's St Crispin's day speech at Agincourt, and through a careful consideration of the Chorus's exhortation of the audience to construct memory between the acts of the play, the chapter reflects on how successful the play is in allowing the creation and transmission of its portrayal of historical events through language. The play sometimes struggles with this task, as it can find itself constrained by the language it is obliged to employ. But this struggle reveals that the play's memories of the events it dramatizes inhere as much in the style and structure of the play as in its characters or actions.

Language is central to the study of memory in this thesis. It is not only what the plays say - through their choice of story or characterisation - but *how* they say it and in what context, that releases and interrogates memories of places and people and times, for both audience and characters. Let us turn now to the plays and to see the '*art of memory*' in Shakespeare's second tetralogy at work.

⁸⁸ See Leonard F. Dean, *Tudor Theories of Historical Writing* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1947), pp. 3-4.

CHAPTER FOUR:
MEMORY AND IDENTITY IN *RICHARD II*

In this chapter I want to concentrate on how memories not only create but also complicate identity in *Richard II*, and particularly on how they destabilise Richard's identity. There are two ways in which I wish to do this. The first is to look at instances where characters remember and discuss Richard in order to see how they problematize his identity as king. The second is to examine Richard's own memories of himself to see how they shape his subjectivity - his experience of, and relationship with, his own identity. I will use a few key examples in both approaches and, where appropriate, draw brief parallels with other plays in the tetralogy. I hope these examples will illustrate how memories in the play constantly disclose the potential for alternative forms of subjectivity, even if in the last analysis such alternatives are beyond Richard's reach.

Remembering Richard

An obvious facet of Richard's identity which is complicated by memory is his royalty. If we track the use of Richard's name and title through the play, it reveals much about the ways in which his identity is perceived and recalled by those around him. Marvin Spevack confirms that names are very important to identity: 'Shakespeare [. . .] was obsessed with names. [. . .] In all instances names both define the individual self and populate the world.'¹

One of the first references to the degradation of Richard's title occurs when Gaunt says to Richard, 'Landlord of England art thou now, not king' (2.1.113). That this line occurs towards the end of Gaunt's speech is significant, because it is the last in a series of accusations which finally reaches the limits of what Richard can endure; Richard furiously interrupts Gaunt to remind him of his rank, questioning his reprimand: 'Darest with thy frozen admonition | Make pale our cheek, chasing the royal blood | With fury from his native residence?' (2.1.117-9) Richard chooses his

¹ Marvin Spevack, 'Beyond Individualism: Names and Namelessness in Shakespeare', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 56:1 (Autumn, 1993), 383-98 (pp. 386, 387).

'right royal majesty' (l. 120) both to rebut Gaunt's rebuke and to justify his rage at Gaunt's presumption 'on an ague's privilege' (l. 116). But Gaunt has begun an action which other characters in the play continue; Richard's title is repeatedly discarded by those who seek his deposition. And Richard may be justified in insisting on his proper title, since, as Spevack notes:

The concentration on name is not the simple ego-building or parading to be expected of tragic characters. The bond it implies may, in fact, increase the vulnerability of the individual to the machinations of agents of destruction who invoke name and heritage to accomplish their own ends.²

Richard rightly senses that Gaunt's misuse of his title will lead to further 'machinations' by other characters in the play, who seek to sever the bond between the words 'king' and 'Richard', which, to amend Spevack's formulation, disconnects 'name and heritage to accomplish their own ends.'

Just over a hundred lines after Gaunt's speech, Northumberland argues that 'The king is not himself' (2.1.241). He means that the king has been 'basely led | By flatterers' (ll. 241-2), but a secondary implication is that Richard has lost his power and authority. In the next act Northumberland is pulled up by York for omitting Richard's title:

NORTHUMBERLAND	Richard not far from hence hath hid his head.
YORK	It would beseem the Lord Northumberland To say 'King Richard'. Alack the heavy day When such a sacred king should hide his head.
NORTHUMBERLAND	Your grace mistakes; only to be brief Left I his title out.
YORK	The time hath been, Would you have been so brief with him, he would Have been so brief with you to shorten you, For taking so the head, your whole head's length. (3.3.6-14)

The quibble here on 'head', meaning both the uppermost part of the body and 'title', is what drives York's response to Northumberland's slight. In this passage there are seventy-six words; only ten of them contain more than one syllable ('Richard', 'beseem', 'Northumberland', 'Richard', 'Alack', 'heavy', 'sacred', 'mistakes', 'shorten' and 'taking'). The cumulative effect of the monosyllabic words is to give the staccato

² Spevack, 'Beyond Individualism: Names and Namelessness in Shakespeare', p. 389.

exchange a shortness of breath and temper which spurs it along, reflecting the testy moods of both speakers.

Northumberland begins in the past tense: Richard 'not far from hence hath hid his head'. The alliteration lends his line an almost mocking tone, but York is quick to point out Northumberland's misdemeanour by insisting on using titles: both 'Lord Northumberland' and 'King Richard'. His second line - 'To say "King Richard". Alack the heavy day' - is hypermetrical, as if to accommodate Richard's title, and give it extra emphasis. York's extension of this line, made even longer by the caesura, lends his words the requisite stress and prominence. York then delivers a line which could be seen as fusing past, present and future: 'Alack the heavy day | When such a sacred king should hide his head'. York's words involve at once a memory of Richard's anointed identity as 'a sacred king', a reflection on the present 'heavy day' when his royalty is being disregarded, and an anticipation of the time when he will indeed 'hide his head'. York's line also echoes Northumberland's alliteration in an attempt to reclaim the latter phrase for his own admonitory purpose.

Northumberland's response to York's attack is defensive, but he has understood York's topic perfectly: he begins with 'Your grace', mirroring York's pointed use of titles. The caesura suspends Northumberland's speech long enough for York to grasp that the 'mistake' was his, not Northumberland's. Northumberland's 'brief' (because catalectic) line mirrors his excuse: 'only to be brief | Left I his title out'.

York's response is unequivocally in the past tense, a memory of Richard *par excellence*:

The time hath been,
Would you have been so brief with him, he would
Have been so brief with you to shorten you,
For taking so the head, your whole head's length.
(3.3.11-4)

Again York picks up one of the words Northumberland has used. He uses it twice in an identical formulation - 'have been so brief with' - changing only the final word, 'him', to 'you', to transform the meaning of the phrase. 'Shorten' complements 'brief', and the final line hammers home the quibble on 'head' in both senses of 'title' and a part of the body. Ultimately, however, the exchange only underscores the fact that

although Richard still possesses his royal title in theory, his power belongs to the past, a mere memory of 'the time [that] hath been'.

In this exchange, Northumberland is quick to retract his apparent lapse, but he subsequently repeats the fault, both when he fails to kneel to Richard (3.3.75), and later during the deposition scene when he calls Richard 'My lord' (4.1.252). When Northumberland does not genuflect to Richard, Richard's response is:

We are amazed, and thus long have we stood
To watch the fearful bending of thy knee
Because we thought ourself thy lawful king.
And if we be, how dare thy joints forget
To pay their awful duty to our presence?
(3.3.72-6)

Richard adopts the royal plural, 'we' which reflects his status as the 'lawful king'. However, he undermines that status by making it conditional ('if we be'), as if inviting Northumberland to argue that he is not. The way Richard puts his phrase – 'we thought ourself thy lawful king' - likewise allows for the possibility that his belief that he was Northumberland's lawful king is a subjective supposition rather than an objective fact. Of course, Richard employs the phrase 'we thought ourself' ironically, but the effect is to allow his auditors the implicit scope to question his status and title. Richard uses the language of memory to upbraid Northumberland for his disrespectful attitude towards him: 'how dare thy joints *forget* | To pay their awful duty?' (my emphasis). His speech reminds Northumberland of the 'awful duty' owed him because of his 'lawful' kingship. For Northumberland, the forgotten 'awful' (reverential, full of awe) duty becomes a remembered present duty, which is 'awful' in the sense of being fearful, inspiring dread. Just a hundred lines later, Bolingbroke, as if having taken his cue from Richard here, urges his followers to kneel. But Richard's reply is once again telling as regards his sense of identity:

BOLINGBROKE	Stand all apart, And show fair duty to his majesty. [<i>He kneels down.</i>] My gracious lord.
RICHARD	Fair cousin, you debase your princely knee To make the base earth proud with kissing it. (3.3.187-91)

Richard's reply to Bolingbroke contrasts sharply with his response to Northumberland, not only because Bolingbroke makes a show of remembering and respecting Richard's sovereignty (albeit somewhat belatedly), but also because Richard by this point has accepted that his title will be stripped from him. Five lines later he confirms this when he says to Bolingbroke: 'Your own is yours, and I am yours and all' (l. 196). Bolingbroke is, unlike Northumberland, Richard's 'cousin' (l. 190), and thus of royal blood, but even so, the change of tone reflects a radical change in his perception of himself.

However, when Northumberland lapses into denying Richard his title for a second time, even after this shift in Richard's identity has occurred, Richard's reaction is again volatile. Richard seems to have passed from a mood of acceptance which we encountered during his exchange with Bolingbroke, to one of anger. Northumberland begins to address Richard by saying, 'My lord –', but Richard interrupts in a fury to match that with which he rebuked Gaunt:

No lord of thine, thou haught insulting man,
Nor no man's lord! I have no name, no title –
No, not that name was given me at the font –
But 'tis usurped.

(4.1.253-7)

In this passage once again there is a surfeit of monosyllabic words. Only four contain more than one syllable - 'insulting', 'title', 'given', and 'usurped' - all words that need emphasising for Richard's point to hit home. The relentless negativity of the passage throws Richard's intolerable predicament into relief: his only defence in this speech is to remind Northumberland *ex negativo* how he should be addressed by railing against his being addressed as 'lord' (l. 253). He is not asserting openly in this passage that he is king – in fact, as he admits, 'I have no name, no title - | No, not that name that was given me at the font - | But 'tis usurped.' But he insists that he is not a 'lord' either. The result is that he actualises the very state he complains about – that he is 'nothing'. He will not allow that he is 'lord', but neither is he 'king'; thus he has no 'title' to speak of. Donald Friedman senses similarities between Richard and Lear, commenting that, 'Richard, like Lear, must assume that his title is indistinguishable from his identity, just as his will is indistinguishable from the act that it wills'.³ But if we allow that is the case, we must equally grant that, as Manfred Weidhorn suggests, 'For Richard (and

³ Donald M. Friedman, 'John of Gaunt and the Rhetoric of Frustration', *ELH*, 43 (1976), 279-99 (p. 295).

Lear), name and title, having seemed inseparable, dissolve concurrently.’⁴ The fact of Richard not even possessing the name which was given to him at the font is a case in point of memory making the gulf between his past and his present identity clear. Charles Forker concludes that ‘Richard's obsession with his name betokens his essentialist conception of language - a view of words that allows for no space between signifier and signified.’⁵

Richard remembers his name, his title, and his role of king, and is infuriated that Northumberland does not – or does not seem to. Jonathan Baldo has argued that the deposition scene entails an attempt to erase Richard from the play, to forget him.⁶ But the play's final scenes, its successors in the tetralogy, and its continuing place in the canon show that the deposition scene does anything but erase the memory of Richard and Richard's kingship: in fact, it serves as an all too salient reminder of it. In trying to consign Richard's title to oblivion, the characters around Richard have stumbled upon a means of immortalising him. The occasions when characters remember Richard and discuss his title show how their memories complicate his identity as king. The later examples I have given, where Richard reflects on his title, show that he is aware of his shifting sense of self. I will discuss this in more depth in the next section.

As a coda to this section, I want to reflect on the fact that names and naming as a key facet of identity is a subject which recurs throughout the tetralogy. A good example can be found in *1 Henry IV*, when Falstaff, playing the king, pretends to forget his own name:

A goodly, portly man, i' faith, and a corpulent; of a cheerful look, a pleasing eye and a most noble carriage; and, as I think, his age some fifty, or, by'r Lady, inclining to three score. And now I remember me: his name is Falstaff.
(2.4.410-4)

The point here is that although Falstaff does finally remember his name, even when he is pretending to have forgotten it we know perfectly well to whom he is referring – we remember the identity of the man even without the name. A similar thing happens in

⁴ Manfred Weidhorn, ‘The Relation of Title and Name to Identity in Shakespearean Tragedy’, *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 9:2 (Spring, 1969), 303-19 (p. 311).

⁵ Charles R. Forker, ‘Unstable identity in Shakespeare's *Richard II*’, *Renascence*, 54:1 (Fall, 2001), 3-21 (p. 9).

⁶ Jonathan Baldo, *Memory in Shakespeare's Histories: Stages of Forgetting in Early Modern England* (New York and London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 10-50.

Henry V – Fluellen forgets the name, but remembers the man: ‘the fat knight with the great belly-doublet: he was full of jests, and gipes, and knaveries, and mocks; I have forgot his name’ (4.7.47-8).

Although it is Falstaff and not a king, a proper name and not a title, these examples show that remembering a person’s name is not the final arbiter of their identity. Bolingbroke hopes that by removing Richard’s title he will remove the threat of the man, but as subsequent events prove, only death finally banishes Richard, and even then he lives on in memory. The Falstaff examples show on a smaller scale how removing the name does not necessarily make the person behind the name any less memorable. Richard’s complaint that he is ‘nothing’ (5.5.38) without his name is in this light false, though his anguish is of course understandable, and his hyperbole is part of the dramatic effect of the character and the play. Most of us would feel desecrated if our name or title was stripped from us, but it is unlikely that we would argue that we no longer exist as a consequence. Removing a name is an attempt to abolish identity, which in this case serves to bring it to the forefront of the characters’ conversations.

In *1 Henry IV*, Gadshill offers an insight into the nature of humanity which may explain why ultimately such names are not as essential to the preservation of identity as those around Richard – and, indeed, Richard himself - want to make it. For Richard, his realisation that ‘one’s name had been a mere label, readily removed and forgotten, seems to have gone far towards depriving the body in human shape of its sense of itself, of its *human* personality.’⁷ But he has forgotten that we all share one name: ‘Go to. *Homo* is a common name to all men’ (2.1.94). Although to apply this statement to *Richard II* is to take it out of context, it can nevertheless shed light on the play, because it encapsulates the reason why Bolingbroke and his followers are unsuccessful in their attempts to expunge Richard from memory by forgetting his title of ‘King’: they and the audience still recognise Richard as a member of the human race, who cannot be so easily forgotten, even if he himself should desire it. Part of the tragic pathos of the deposition scene relies on the audience’s perception of Richard not only as a king stripped of his status and title, but also as a man subjected to cruel humiliations. In the next section I will look at how Richard’s subjectivity fluctuates between his identity as

⁷ Weidhorn, ‘The Relation of Title and Name to Identity in Shakespearean Tragedy’, p. 303 (my emphasis).

king and his identity as 'homo', and how his failure to grasp fully the humanity he shares with others around him is symptomatic of his egocentric world view.

Richard Remembering

At crucial moments throughout the play, Richard reflects on his subjectivity. It is helpful to differentiate between the terms subjectivity and identity. Linda Charnes offers a clear definition: subjectivity is 'the subject's *experience* of his or her relationship to his or her "identity."' ⁸ His *identity* is his self as perceived by others around him; his *subjectivity* is his personal experience of his identity. In this section I will show how in two key scenes – at Barkloughly Castle (3.2) and at Pomfret (5.5) – Richard's subjectivity is predominantly based on, created by, and unsettled by, memories, of himself and of kings before him. Harry Berger has argued persuasively that at these points in the play Richard is as much his own auditor as an actor performing for the benefit of others: 'every interlocutory act is partly a soliloquy in which the speaker constitutes himself as the theatre audience he shares confidences with or tries to persuade, affect, deceive.' ⁹ For a moment in these two scenes, Richard is 'persuaded' or 'deceived' into seeing alternative conceptions of his self, other options for his subjectivity, but ultimately they recede into the background as he takes his place as king, even when deposed.

3.2.155-77: 'How can you say to me I am a king?'

3.2 is a pivotal moment in the play, as it is here that Richard reaches a crisis point and finally starts to reflect on who he is and what that means for his present, for his future, and for how he is remembered. Harry Berger has stated that 'the scene appears to direct curiosity to the question [. . .] "What lies behind his blatant experiments in self-representation?"' ¹⁰ Throughout this section I will argue that memories seep into Richard's consciousness, finding expression in his language and complicating his subjectivity. His 'experiments in self-representation' are a manifestation of this

⁸ Linda Charnes, *Notorious Identity: Materializing the Subject in Shakespeare* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1993), p. 8 (emphasis in original).

⁹ Harry Berger, 'Richard II 3.2: An Exercise in Imaginary Audition', *ELH* 55:4 (1988), 755-96 (p. 756).

¹⁰ Harry Berger, *Imaginary Audition: Shakespeare on Stage and Page* (Berkeley, CA and London: University of California Press, 1989), p. 105.

complexity, as Richard tries to work through some of the different versions of himself that memories provide him with. I have chosen to focus on twenty-two lines close to the end of the scene that show this well. In this case, Richard conceives of himself both as a doomed king and as a member of a wider and more humble humanity almost simultaneously:

For God's sake let us sit upon the ground
And tell sad stories of the death of kings –
How some have been deposed, some slain in war,
Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed,
Some poisoned by their wives, some sleeping killed –
All murdered. For within the hollow crown
That rounds the mortal temples of a king
Keeps Death his court; and there the antic sits,
Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp,
Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
To monarchize, be feared and kill with looks,
Infusing him with self and vain conceit,
As if this flesh which walls about our life
Were brass impregnable; and humoured thus,
Comes at the last and with a little pin
Bores through his castle wall, and farewell, king!
Cover your heads, and mock not flesh and blood
With solemn reverence. Throw away respect,
Tradition, form and ceremonious duty,
For you have but mistook me all this while.
I live with bread like you, feel want,
Taste grief, need friends. Subjected thus,
How can you say to me I am a king?

(3.2.155-77)

The first two lines immediately show that the speech which follows relies on memory for its provenance:

For God's sake let us sit upon the ground
And tell sad stories of the death of kings –

'[S]ad stories' are not the actual occasions but accounts of them. Any story – not least the *de casibus* tradition to which Richard refers when he cites the 'sad stories of the death of kings' – relies on memory for its oral dissemination and aural retention. The sibilance of 'sake', 'us', 'sit', 'sad' and 'stories' makes these two lines particularly audible to an audience. The 'us' may be the royal plural, since ordinarily decorum

demanded that Richard's subjects stood while he was sitting, but these lines could also be construed as a command, in which case 'us' could refer to him and his followers. But it could also be seen as referring to the wider audience, and at a stretch, all humankind: 'let us sit upon the ground' thus prefigures Richard's later lines (174-7), which confirm that his subjectivity is tied at least to that of his followers, if not to a wider audience. At the opening of this passage, one interpretation invited by the pronoun 'us' is that remembering 'sad stories' together is a means of establishing a communal identity, just as shared 'bread', 'want' and 'grief' unite Richard with his fellows at the end of the quotation. The next four lines (157-60) could be seen likewise as designed to distance himself from the remembered kings of the stories:

How some have been deposed, some slain in war,
Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed,
Some poisoned by their wives, some sleeping killed –
All murdered.

The word 'some' in the first three of these lines could be read as signifying some of them or some of us. In the former case, the effect would be to detach Richard from the memories of the kings, whereas in the latter case it would unite him with them. Given what has happened to these kings, particularly those who 'have been deposed', Richard seems to mean some of us, since he forms his current subjectivity by conflating his story with that of these kings of old. The line 'Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed', whose repetition of the word 'deposed' ties it to himself, indicates what Richard might do to Bolingbroke, while the metamorphosis of 'some' into 'all' in 'All murdered' anticipates his own death. The parallelism of the lines makes them memorable, but also states something simple, which belies the actual importance of their veiled message about Richard's own fate. The precise ways in which the kings have been 'deposed', 'slain', 'haunted' 'poisoned' and so on are not explained; rather, *Richard II* itself becomes the 'sad story' of 'how' a king has 'been deposed' and 'murdered'.

Harry Berger remarks that it is an easy glide from "'some have been depos'd" through "some will be depos'd" to "some will have been depos'd"'.¹¹ Berger has noted Richard's potential slide into the future perfect tense here, an observation which has

¹¹ Berger, *Imaginary Audition*, p. 121.

been given too little attention. In terms of my concern with memory the phrase reveals Richard not only envisaging the future but also creating his future subjectivity from the memories of other 'sad stories' as a king who was 'deposed' and 'murdered'. Richard seems unable to envisage a future free from the precedents and patterns of the past, but ties it to the fates of the kings of former times. At this point in the speech, Richard's destiny is dictated by memories which show his current and his future subjectivity in a particular light.

This is something that Henry V fears on the eve of Agincourt when he prays, 'Not today, O Lord, | O not today, think not upon the fault | My father made in compassing the crown' (*Henry V*, 4.1.289-91). Henry fears that his own legacy as king, decided by battles such as those at Harfleur and Agincourt, has been preordained by the past deeds of another king – in this case, his father's deposition of Richard. As it happens, Hal wins the battles and the war, and secures his legacy at least in the play's terms (Epilogue 5-8), but it is notable that the memory of Richard worries Hal just as the memory of other kings worries Richard.

The next sentence of Richard's speech is so long that it is easy to forget that it is only one sentence, but it explains why Richard feels his future is limited by the patterns of the past, and it is to do with the levelling effect of Death, which I discuss further in my chapter on *2 Henry IV*:

For within the hollow crown
That rounds the mortal temples of a king
Keeps Death his court; and there the antic sits,
Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp,
Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
To monarchize, be feared and kill with looks,
Infusing him with self and vain conceit,
As if this flesh which walls about our life
Were brass impregnable; and humoured thus,
Comes at the last and with a little pin
Bores through his castle wall, and farewell, king!

There is so much happening in this extended metaphor, with its multiple clauses, that it is easy to overlook its import, which at its simplest is that Death is ever present with a king and will come when he is most in the 'humour' of 'self and vain conceit' – a humour which, it can be argued, Richard has just demonstrated in the preceding lines of this scene. The 'hollow crown' is 'hollow' in being both literally empty but also

ultimately meaningless. Death is personified as a jester, 'the antic', while the king is an actor performing a 'little scene', able to 'monarchize', to simulate sovereignty like a player. The 'little scene', like 'the hollow crown', suggests two things: in this case both brevity and futility. Despite the continual references to the single 'king' – 'his state' and 'his pomp' and his 'breath' – towards the end of this passage Richard switches into the plural in the phrase 'our life'. This could be the royal plural, but the conjunction 'For' with which the sentence begins makes it more likely that Richard is remembering and generalising about the dead kings he has just spoken of in lines 157-60. The hendiadys of 'self and vain' and the polysyndeton of the repeated 'ands' that join all these clauses together reinforce the allegorical thrust of the sentence, which ends with 'Comes at the last and with a little pin | Bores through his castle wall, and farewell, king!'. The line beginning 'Comes at the last...' (l. 169) is almost monosyllabic, as if to underline the bathetic simplicity of the end of the king despite the convoluted sentence that describes it. One of the things which make this sentence so elaborate is the constantly shifting subject. We can never be entirely sure in this sentence whether Richard is referring to himself, to other kings, or to both.

This passage is of course a *memento mori*: Charles Forker remarks that:

Here Shakespeare draws upon the memento mori tradition of late medievalism - the Dance of Death as famously illustrated by Hans Holbein the Younger in his widely circulated series of woodcuts, *Imagines Mortis* (1538).¹²

But Berger sees it also as an *ars moriendi*:

The aim of the *ars moriendi*, which may be cultivated at any time in life, is to write one's own epitaph, to shape the death mask that will control the future by representing the deceased as he or she wishes to be remembered.¹³

What Berger has obliquely hit upon here is the way memories relate to this part of Richard's speech. In discussing himself with reference to these other kings, and by expounding his own impermanence, Richard speaks his own autobiography. In doing so he is regaining some sort of control over the life that remains to him, and over his impending death. By pre-empting Bolingbroke's act of deposition he seems to choose it, which is a powerful exercise of free will. Richard remembers his mortality, shared

¹² Forker, 'Unstable Identity in Shakespeare's *Richard II*', p. 7.

¹³ Berger, *Imaginary Audition*, p. 119.

not only with these 'murdered' kings of lines 157-60, but also, as he comes to realise in the next part of the speech, with all humanity regardless of rank. Richard's realisation of the transience of his own life is a corollary of remembering the deaths of these kings who came before him. His subjectivity as king is confirmed by his end matching those of other 'deposed' and 'murdered' kings; but his subjectivity is equally dependent on his realisation of his status as a 'mortal' creature tricked out with a 'hollow' crown, and allowed no more than a 'little' life. When he gives his crown to Bolingbroke in the deposition scene (4.1.182-215), Richard realises and plays upon 'The obvious indivisibility of symbol and person'.¹⁴ Yet here, not only Death but Richard himself scoffs at his state and grins at his pomp:

Cover your heads, and mock not flesh and blood
With solemn reverence. Throw away respect,
Tradition, form and ceremonious duty,
For you have but mistook me all this while.
I live with bread like you, feel want,
Taste grief, need friends. Subjected thus,
How can you say to me I am a king?

Once again Richard confesses that he is 'flesh and blood'. He asks his followers to put their hats back on and 'Throw away respect, | Tradition, form and ceremonious duty'. In insisting that they have mistaken him he is insisting that they have remembered him awry – that the identity they have thrust upon him does not match his own subjectivity. At the same time he is reproaching his followers for forgetting the humanity he shares with them. Richard is becoming, in Ernst Kantorowicz's terms, the body natural, not the body politic.¹⁵ Elizabeth Klett explains that:

According to medieval doctrine, the King culturally and legally had two bodies: the body natural, and the body politic, which were united in the person of the monarch. The body natural was human and fallible, while the body politic encapsulated the King's identity as God's representative. Kantorowicz argues that *Richard II* dramatizes the breaking apart of these two bodies.¹⁶

¹⁴ Spevack, 'Beyond Individualism: Names and Namelessness in Shakespeare', p. 387.

¹⁵ Ernst H. Kantorowicz, 'Chapter II: Shakespeare: King Richard II', in *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957), pp. 24-41.

¹⁶ Elizabeth Klett, 'Many Bodies, Many Voices: Performing Androgyny in Fiona Shaw and Deborah Warner's *Richard II*', *Theatre Journal*, 58:2 (May, 2006), 175-91 (p. 185).

Charles Forker concurs that 'Richard's emotional volatility and psychological complexity, frequently discussed in other contexts, stem essentially from conflicts inherent in his dual role as king and man - as both *rex imago Dei* and as fallible mortal.'¹⁷ The evidence Richard himself cites for the emergence or dominance of his body natural is that he lives 'with bread like you, feel[s] want, | Taste[s] grief, need[s] friends'. The first of these lines is monosyllabic, and both are tetrameters. Richard's simple diction allies him to simple men with whom he shares the same bodily needs.

It is interesting that Richard should choose 'taste' as the verb to describe his experience of grief, since it is impossible to present on stage, as opposed to other sensory verbs such as to touch, to see or, of course, to hear. By choosing 'taste' Richard insists that the audience draw on their own personal tangible experiences to understand him. He makes his shared humanity with his followers and the audience palpable by sharing this sense with them, and invites them to experience that grief by recalling their taste of it for themselves. *Richard II* ties with *Troilus and Cressida* in having the most references to the word 'taste' in the canon; and Gaunt uses a similar technique to Richard when he proclaims on his deathbed that 'the last taste of sweets, is sweetest last, | Writ in remembrance more than things long past' (2.1.13-4). He chooses taste as the means to draw the audience into the metaphor in the following two lines, which refer more straightforwardly to another sense: 'Though Richard my life's counsel would not hear, | My death's sad tale may yet undeaf his ear' (2.1.15-6). Although Gaunt's choice of words here cannot fail to remind us of Richard's reflection on the 'sad stories of the death of kings' (3.2.156), it is ironic that what 'undeafs' Richard's ear is not Gaunt's 'sad tale' but the 'sad stories' of other kings. Thus Richard tries in these closing moments to persuade his followers to see him as a member of humanity, sharing senses, wants and needs with them. In denying his kingship, Richard finds a new subjectivity, 'For names, like systems, limit and restrict',¹⁸ so that ridding himself of the name of king grants him 'The freedom of namelessness, of bondlessness, an alternative to the individualism normally associated with the Renaissance. [. . .] [P]aradoxically, the loss of identity is the condition for self-

¹⁷ Forker, 'Unstable Identity in Shakespeare's *Richard II*', p. 3.

¹⁸ Spevack, 'Beyond Individualism: Names and Namelessness in Shakespeare', p. 393.

fulfillment'¹⁹ as a human being. Thus Shakespeare suggests a freedom which 'involves a denial of self and of name, of family and of state, of structures and boundaries.'²⁰

However, almost as soon as it is suggested, it is quashed: ultimately, Richard's last word in this speech is 'king', which brings us back to the start of the passage quoted, and reminds us that this is, after all, the sad story of the death of a king. It is kings who have opened Richard's ears to the destiny to which his actions have propelled him, not the death of Gaunt or his own mistreatment of Bolingbroke or others. This realisation invests the speech with even more pathos: in the instant of trying on his new subjectivity of subjection, he seems only to confirm his subjectivity as doomed king. This suggests that he is unable to escape the memories of those who have preceded him in the line of rule, even if he wants to. The very language he uses means that he – as his own audience – oscillates between seeing himself as a king and as a man, but in the final analysis he struggles to accept himself as a mere man. 'If name and heritage serve to limit the individual at the same time that they define, then it may be said that Shakespeare is indeed criticizing the inherited structure at the very moment he would seem to be supporting it.'²¹ The memories of those other kings have rendered Richard's subjectivity problematic, 'limiting' as well as 'defining' it, but, unsurprisingly, they have not released him from his royalty. Richard is trapped in his culturally conditioned conception of himself. In the end he seems unable to shake off his conviction that 'Not all the water in the rough rude sea | Can wash the balm off from an anointed king' (3.3.54-5).

Richard has tried to persuade his followers to perceive him at this moment as a man like them, who lives, who feels, who tastes, which is not dissimilar to Henry V insisting on the eve of Agincourt that:

I think the King is but a man, as I am: the violet smells to him as it doth to me;
the element shows to him as it doth to me; all his senses have but human
conditions; his ceremonies laid by, in his nakedness he appears but a man.
(4.4.102-6)

However, Henry meets with the reply from Williams, who speaks on behalf of his fellow common soldiers, that 'That's more than we know' (4.1.129), and ultimately Richard and indeed Henry are not able to escape their memories, their followers'

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 394.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 391.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 390.

memories, and the audience's memories – to this day - of them as kings. Richard's prison soliloquy, in which he thinks about different aspects of his subjectivity by trying to envisage himself as a mere beggar, before ending up, once again, a king, reframes 3.2.155-77. I turn to it now.

5.5.31-41: 'I was better when a king'

The play's final investigation of Richard's complex subjectivity due to memories takes place in his soliloquy in 5.5. Although his speech in 3.2 was delivered as if it were a soliloquy, this is the only true soliloquy Richard has in the play. It is another example of Berger's surmise that Richard is his own audience. John Palmer agrees: Richard is 'possibly the only appreciative witness of his tragedy';²² for E. K. Chambers too, Richard 'becomes an interested spectator of his own ruin.'²³ Charles Forker seems unaware that such 'imaginary audition' is possible, though he contradicts himself in the space of a single paragraph: 'Here uniquely we see Richard without an onstage audience [. . .] fragmenting himself into a collection of listeners to his own performance.'²⁴ Richard *is* his own 'onstage audience'.²⁵ I want to focus on just eleven lines of this soliloquy, which show Richard examining his divided self.

Thus play I in one person²⁶ many people,
And none contented. Sometimes am I king;
Then treasons make me wish myself a beggar,
And so I am. Then crushing penury
Persuades me I was better when a king;
Then I am kinged again, and by and by
Think that I am unkinged by Bolingbroke,
And straight am nothing. But whate'er I be,
Nor I nor any man that but man is
With nothing shall be pleased till he be eased
With being nothing.

(5.5.31-41)

There are five instances of caesura in this short speech and they all occur at pivotal moments (lines 32, 34, 36, 38, 41): time stops for a moment as Richard thinks about

²² John Palmer, *Political Characters of Shakespeare* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1945), p. 159.

²³ E. K. Chambers, *Shakespeare: A Survey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1926), p. 91.

²⁴ *Richard II*, ed. Forker, p. 45.

²⁵ Klett, 'Many Bodies, Many Voices', p. 184.

²⁶ We must accept the Q2 and Folio reading of this word – 'prison' – as a possibility, though for my purposes, I prefer the Q1 reading, 'person'.

how to continue. Shakespeare carefully incorporates such pauses into Richard's speech in order to allow both character and audience to reflect on his logic: as Philip Hobsbaum observes, 'it is possible to make the silence speak.'²⁷

These pauses have three potential effects. Firstly, they could be places where memories seep away in order that Richard's subjectivity can change or move, possibly into something new. Secondly, and conversely, they could be places where a consistent subjectivity is forged, as memories move into the space provided to support Richard's established subjective view of himself. Thirdly, they could serve as an ellipsis or lacuna that signifies the nothingness, the void encroaching on the speech and thus on Richard's consciousness. After each pause Richard reconstitutes his subjectivity, so that as he begins to speak again his speech imagines and articulates a new subjectivity. The first effect of the pauses seems to work in this way, memories leaching away to allow a different subjectivity to emerge. At the same time, these pauses have the further effect of sustaining or preserving Richard's memory of himself as he was prior to this point in the play: a doomed memory charged with pathos. As for the third effect, they also tacitly express Richard's longing for the oblivion of death.

The speech is chock-full of memory masquerading as imaginative story. The first line reads: 'Thus play I in one person many people' (5.5.31). The line implies that Richard is an actor who can perform the parts of many different characters in a play. In his 'one person' the different identities of 'many people' are already immanent. Thus in seeming to act, to 'play', Richard is reflecting on his potential to adopt diverse identities and destinies: as Klett has observed, 'The theme of performance runs through Shakespeare's depiction of the monarch; Richard self-consciously manipulates the pageantry that is part of kingship.'²⁸ But 'many people' may be misleading, since the lines that follow mention just three roles – 'king', 'beggar', and 'nothing'. The lines that follow adumbrate not only the social poles these identities might span – from king to beggar – but also Richard's subjective experience of these identities: 'contented', 'crushing penury', 'nothing'. Scott McMillin observes that in this speech, 'All is contained within himself [. . .] Richard is everyone and no one at once. The [. . .] king burgeons so with identity that identity is what he lacks. Being nothing is a pleasure.'²⁹

²⁷ Philip Hobsbaum, *Rhythm, Metre and Verse Form* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 15.

²⁸ Klett, 'Many Bodies, Many Voices', p. 184.

²⁹ Scott McMillin, 'Shakespeare's *Richard II*: Eyes of Sorrow, Eyes of Desire', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 35:1 (Spring, 1981), 10-52 (p. 47).

What confirms this speech's concern with exploring subjectivity is the plethora of first-person pronouns, frequently followed by the first-person present tense of the verb 'to be'. If we look at the speech line by line, we can track the tenses to see how memories obfuscate Richard's subjectivity. Richard uses the present tense: I play; I am king; I wish; 'I am'. But then he switches to the past tense – the only instance of that tense used in this speech – 'I was better when a king'. The meaning of this line within the speech, as one of Richard's acted roles or 'people', and its meaning for him as a deposed king, merge into one another. His memory tells him that in the past he 'was better when a king', but the following lines revert to the present tense, so that his current subjectivity is revealed: he says, 'I am kinged again', but in the following line he concedes, 'I am unkinged'; I 'am nothing'. Weidhorn observes that, 'After a lifetime as "King Richard" it is easier to understand oneself a cipher, a nothing, than as simply poor Richard.'³⁰ By making the noun 'king' into the verbs 'kinged' and 'unkinged' (the *OED* lists *Richard II* as providing the first instances of both words), Richard effectively gives kingship a power, an agency, which it does not possess for him in reality. The repetition of the word as 'king' and its variants, as much as the memory of what the word represents, suggests how hard the role is to shake off. We see this resort to place throughout the speech. The repetition of 'I', 'And', 'Then', and 'by' reinforces the impression of a speech which has reached its argument less by following rigorous logic than by the cumulative effect of repeated experiences.

Lois Potter contends that 'language is a source of power in the play, even though there is also an awareness of its inadequacy.'³¹ Richard chooses and uses words carefully here, and in that sense he gives them power, but in another sense they are also limiting because they are repeating – remembering – the same types of subjectivity and experience. The meagre scope of Richard's control over language becomes apparent: memories embodied in Richard's words become a technique of self-definition, but as he discovers, they are also inadequate as a means of catharsis, because they recall an anguished past: 'I was better when a king'.

Finally Richard's speech leaps into the future tense:

whate'er I be,

³⁰ Weidhorn, 'The Relation of Title and Name to Identity in Shakespearean Tragedy', p. 311.

³¹ Lois Potter, 'The Antic Disposition of Richard II', *Shakespeare Survey Volume 27: Shakespeare's Early Tragedies* (1974), 33-41 (p. 39).

Nor I nor any man that but man is
With nothing shall be pleased till he be eased
With being nothing.

(ll. 38-41)

Most editors plump for a reading that glosses the lines, 'no man will be pleased with anything until he is nothing' (i.e., dead), thus turning the first 'nothing' into a double negative. However, since these lines anticipate Richard's impending actual death in the play, the lines can imply a more personal meaning for Richard, an expression of Richard's desire for death, or, more precisely, for annihilation. These lines are eerily reminiscent of Richard's earlier line to Bolingbroke: 'Make me, that nothing have, with nothing grieved' (4.1.216). But in switching from the first- to the third-person pronoun in this sentence, Richard distances himself from the thought of the ultimate 'nothing' of death. The 'nothing' of lines 39 and 40 is emphasised by being the only disyllabic word in both lines. This speech demonstrates how verbal repetition can breed, but more to the point complicate, memory, and in this case unsettle Richard's subjective reflection on his own identity. The anaphora of 'With', the repetition of 'man/man', the internal rhyme of 'pleased/eased', and the repetition of 'nothing' in lines 40 and 41 (harking back to the 'nothing' in line 38), all contribute to this effect. This speech strikingly illustrates how under the stress of circumstances Richard's rich, imaginative memories of his life as 'king', as 'beggar', and as 'nothing', woven into a microcosmic story of his life and fall, reveal the potentiality for other forms of subjectivity. Winifred Nowotny observes of Richard 'that there are enough mutually contradictory facts in his situation to make every rôle equally possible and impossible.'³²

The question that Richard raises in this speech, at this moment when the audience is likely to feel sympathy with him, is, what is the cost of his shifting subjectivity? For Richard it is a fractured subjectivity resulting from conflicting memories of the self, first as king and then as nothing. That the words 'king' and 'nothing' rhyme is not accidental but likely to remind us of their relationship in Richard's eyes. In this speech Richard vacillates and seems confused by the alternatives available to him, but as he dies he still thinks of himself as king, rebuking his assassin Exton for having 'with the King's blood stained the King's own land' (5.5.110). However, this indictment dispenses with the alternative identity of 'beggar' invoked in

³² Winifred Nowotny, *The Language Poets Use* (London and New York: The Athlone Press, 1965), p. 90.

earlier lines. Richard's real final sentence makes true empathy with the 'beggar' impossible, and betrays his intractable belief in the singularity and superiority of his royal identity, which authorised his autocratic behaviour in the first half of the play, and thus led to his deposition by disgruntled nobles who could not tolerate his treatment of them. The true sadness of Richard's story is that he never fully grasps his shared humanity with his peers, let alone with the 'beggar' on whom he muses in his final hours.

In this chapter I have deliberately 'slowed down' characters' lines in order to see how their memories create and complicate Richard's identity and subjectivity. But I agree with Berger that:

deceleration, the armchair reader's privilege, is not enough. Slowing lines down deprives them of their force as a speech act. They must be reaccelerated so that we may imagine them flying by, and this is especially important in Richard's case. Only by imagining words spoken at normal tempo can we fully appreciate the peculiar power Shakespeare bestows on his protagonist – the rhetorical aggressiveness with which Richard floods his auditors with more meanings than the ear can catch, the joy with which he races through one overdetermined text after another.³³

While close reading reveals how memories unsettle Richard's identity and subjectivity, the way these memories are expressed in the play on the stage, at the speed of an actor speaking rather than in slow-motion when being read, make the feat all the more remarkable. Memories are instrumental in how Richard perceives himself and is perceived by others, yet an audience may not even notice this on first hearing, or may notice it only up to a point, because memories inform and mould identity in such a surreptitious way. Breaking the speeches down as I have done shows how this is accomplished, but we cannot deny that much is masked from the audience when they only listen and watch.

Memories of Times to Come

To conclude this chapter, I want to look at two instances of forward recollection in the play which, like the remembered past, obscure Richard's identity, but from the

³³ Berger, 'Richard II 3.2: An Exercise in Imaginary Audition', p. 786.

perspective of a 'remembered' future. Again, as with 'subjectivity', it is helpful to reiterate what I mean by 'forward recollection'. Marjorie Garber defines it perfectly:

The history play seems to say to the audience: 'This is your past.' In the experience of the playgoer, however, the past becomes a future: when the audience enters the theatre, the historical events are yet to come. The history play as such is thus lodged in the paradoxical temporality of what the French call *futur antérieur*, the prior future, the tense of what 'will have occurred.'³⁴

Characters in the play who proleptically foresee events in their own futures, but in the audience's past, are engaging in Berger's 'future perfect', in Garber's 'prior future', in Kierkegaard's 'forward recollection'. 'Whether they derive their authority from history or from theatrical convention, such prophecies are harbingers of truth and become a kind of plot against which the plays' protagonists may struggle in vain.'³⁵ In terms of Richard's identity, the two examples of forward recollection I have chosen contribute to the view of Richard as a doomed king, since they recall his future deposition and the reign of Bolingbroke before they have occurred in the play.

The examples I would like to explore entail a comparison of Gaunt's 'This England' speech at 2.1.31-68 with Carlisle's companion speech at 4.1.137-150. The first speech reflects directly on Richard's identity as king, while the second, in descanting on Bolingbroke's actions, reflects obliquely on the fate of the land under Richard. Both speeches engage in prophecy, ostensibly predicting time to come while simultaneously remembering times past. Gaunt's speech begins:

Methinks I am a prophet new inspired
And thus, expiring, do foretell of him.
[. . .]
This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England,
This nurse, this teeming womb of royal kings
[. . .]
Is now leased out – I die pronouncing it –
Like to a tenement or pelting farm.

(2.1.31-2, 50-1, 59-60)

Gaunt predicts that Richard is 'possessed now to depose [him]self' (l. 108), and Richard starts to bring about this prophecy by almost immediately seizing '[t]he plate, coin,

³⁴ Marjorie Garber, "'What's Past Is Prologue': Temporality and Prophecy in Shakespeare's History Plays', in *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History and Interpretation*, ed. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1986), pp. 301-31 (pp. 306-7).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 307.

revenues and moveables| Whereof... Gaunt did stand possessed' (ll. 161-2). Gaunt's 'womb of royal kings' becomes the Queen's empty womb full of 'nothing' in the following scene (2.2.12); as Graham Holderness has noted, 'the place where history should be is revealed, on closer examination, to be yet another empty space.'³⁶ The womb has become a tomb.

Although I have quoted only six lines of Gaunt's speech here, in its totality it is 37 lines long. Curiously for a prophecy, it is all in the present tense, but that is precisely what defines a proleptic statement, since it treats a future event as if it is already the case. Richard's actions now are already generating the future Gaunt predicts. In fact, only one line of Gaunt's speech is really a prophecy: 'His rash fierce blaze of riot cannot last' (l. 33), while the rest reflects on the current state of England, as the above lines testify.

In contrast to Gaunt's speech, Carlisle's is almost entirely in the future tense. It relates to Bolingbroke and his progeny, and Forker notes that '3H6 2.5.55-122 has already dramatized the blood shed between fathers and sons predicted here' (4.1.142n.):

And if you crown him, let me prophesy
The blood of England shall manure the ground,
And future ages groan for this foul act.
Peace shall go sleep with Turks and infidels,
And in this seat of peace tumultuous wars
Shall kin with kin and kind with kind confound.
Disorder, horror, fear and mutiny
Shall here inhabit, and this land be called
The field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls.
(4.1.137-145)

There is a great deal in Gaunt's speech which anticipates Carlisle's. Carlisle's speech takes Gaunt's figures and turns them on their heads. So instead of an England 'renowned ... | For Christian service' (Gaunt, 2.1.53-4), England's 'peace' becomes the domain of 'Turks and infidels'. 'This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England' (Gaunt, 2.1.50) becomes '[d]isorder, horror, fear and mutiny', '[t]he field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls'. Likewise, while Gaunt reflects on Richard and Richard's kingship, Carlisle preaches on the new king and the new king's kingship and kinship.

³⁶ Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare: The Histories* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), p. 186.

Gaunt's speech promises disaster if the old king does not mend his ways, while Carlisle's promises disaster should the court depose the old king. If (as is possible) the same actor played both Gaunt and Carlisle, this would have emphasised the correspondence between these two characters, who predict disaster for two kings who seem so different, and yet who share this likeness: Gaunt's prophecy of the ruin of the country will come true, just as Carlisle's prophecy of civil war will; Richard's identity seems set by the time Gaunt makes his speech, but so too is Bolingbroke's.

There is the same dynamic working within Gaunt's and Carlisle's predictions as implied by Garber when describing the 'prior future', since 'Carlisle's prophecy recalls the historical past of Shakespeare's sixteenth-century audience at the same time that it predicts the historical future of his own time.'³⁷ Carlisle stands in his present, gazing at the 'historical future'; for Shakespeare's audience, as for us, standing in our own present, Carlisle's present and future are both in the past.

If an audience member or reader possesses knowledge of how the plot will unfold, it enables them to see the truth or falsity of any premonition or prediction the play contains. As I noted in my last chapter, before these foreshadowings can work, we must already know the plot of the play. Those readers or spectators who do not know the plot or the basic history behind the play share the perception and suspense of the characters. The audience's knowledge of the plot of the play can come from the sources, or from a previous performance or reading, so our retrospective memory is still vitally important: the characters' proleptic or prophetic speeches are illuminated by our particular memories. We understand the play in all its complex temporality only in so far as our memory enables us to listen to a speech and refer it both back to its first foretelling and forward to the next part of the play or tetralogy, where what it foretells might be fully realised. If we do not know the play's sequels, the play is once more hiding its full story from us, in a similar way to when we hear the play as opposed to reading it, as I noted at the close of my last section. The audience who listens and watches for the first time is not privy to the same knowledge as the readers who are re-reading.

Yet neither of these speeches necessarily requires any foreknowledge on the part of the audience, since both announce their prolepsis, Gaunt by calling himself a

³⁷ Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990), p. 126.

'prophet' (2.1.31), and Carlisle by calling his speech a prophecy (4.1.137). In a similar way, when we hear the Captain say "[t]is thought the King is dead' (2.4.7), only a minimal knowledge of the play or the source history is required to know that what has been said will come true, so the play's instances of forward recollection could have worked for the contemporary audience too, albeit in a different way. Even the original audience of *Richard II*, who would have had to wait up to three years for the next 'instalment' of the tetralogy, could still benefit from some of the instances of forward recollection planted in the play, because an intimate knowledge of the play is not essential to notice some of the play's own examples of forward recollection. In places, Shakespeare uses bold strokes to paint the future, which can be recognised by any audience.

Conclusion

From its first moments, the play shows the theme of remembering as a concern of the play when it asks, whose version of events do we believe, Mowbray's or Bolingbroke's? If we were not there to witness what they are arguing about, how do we judge who is lying? Some critics wonder whether audiences will be able to follow the scene's drift based on whether they know the events of *Woodstock* or not,³⁸ but for me that is missing the point. Charles Forker carefully glosses the quarrel between the two factions, but he also notes that:

As *Woodstock* had already dramatised these events, Shakespeare may have assumed some knowledge of them in his audience. But the absence of clarifying details, the obscure motivation and the careful refusal to resolve the truth or falsity of the antagonists' statements in this scene constitute a deliberate dramatic strategy.³⁹

The play shows the confusion that results from Shakespeare's choice to begin the dramatic action *in medias res*, together with his presentation of more than one possible version of events resulting from the characters' complication of memories (or wilful misremembering). That problematization of memories is vital to how characters are perceived by others around them and by the audience, and how they are

³⁸ For example, A. P. Rossiter, *Woodstock: A Moral History* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1946), p. 234.

³⁹ Forker, *Richard II*, p. 186.

subsequently understood and remembered. In other words, the competition staged between their conflicting memories fractures their own identities and those of others around them who are irrevocably implicated in their argument.

I have shown in this chapter examples of how Richard's identity is rendered more elusive by others' memories of him, and how his subjectivity is destabilised by his own fluctuating memories. They have revealed that the play's language is instrumental in relating the different latent identities and forms of subjectivity available to Richard through these various memories, even if ultimately Richard cannot sustain their adoption. Yet *Richard II* also clearly shows how those in power strive to create the single history and identity they want remembered. The most obvious example of this is when Northumberland urges Richard to:

read
These accusations, and these grievous crimes
Committed by your person and your followers
Against the state and profit of this land,
That, by confessing them, the souls of men
May deem that you are worthily deposed.
(4.1.222-7)

Northumberland wants posterity to remember that Bolingbroke was justified in deposing Richard (thus Northumberland writes history) and that Richard was depraved (thus Northumberland affects Richard's identity). Northumberland wants to conclude Richard's physical deposition (handing over the crown) with this oral deposition (where in a kind of confession he speaks his resignation of the monarchy). However, Northumberland all but admits that the articles Richard must read aloud are false, 'accusations' as opposed to facts, and that their purpose is to rig the chronicles and annals to ensure that they record that he was 'worthily deposed'. In Holinshed these articles are described only as a written document, not an oral one, but Shakespeare dramatizes this moment in order to show how, as a member of the victorious party, Northumberland is able to subject Richard to humiliation. It shows Richard's 'tormentor in an ugly light',⁴⁰ but it also shows how history and identity can be manipulated by the victors, who seek to distort and dictate the future memory of generations to come. The play thus confirms the importance of circulating alternative

⁴⁰ Forker, *Richard II*, p. 401.

memories of past events; and the fact that it survives to tell Richard's story as the story of a man as well as a king is the measure of its success in achieving that.

CHAPTER FIVE:
MEMORY AND TIME IN *1 HENRY IV*

In *Richard II* there are 27 references to 'time', 5 to 'hour', and none to 'o'clock', while in comparison, *1 Henry IV* has 38 references to 'time', 13 to 'hour', and 6 to 'o'clock'.¹ *2 Henry IV* has the fewest of these references, with 30 mentions of all three words, while *Henry V* has 32.² The references to time build to a crescendo in *1 Henry IV* and then fade out again. When time is referred to in the play, it is most often as an allusion either to time in the future, such as 'fill up chronicles in time to come' (1.3.170) and 'the time will come' (3.2.144), or to clock time and the desire to know the time of day, such as 'what time of the day is it?' (1.2.1) and 'What's o'clock?' (2.1.31 and 2.4.94).³ Though quite different, these two types of reference imply a sense of impatient waiting or expectation. As Paola Pugliatti observes:

That time, in a number of aspects, is an extremely important component of *1 Henry IV* is evident throughout the text. Indeed, nowhere else does Shakespeare emphasise so punctiliously or underline its importance for almost all the characters in so many different circumstances. Scarcely a scene goes by without our attention being drawn to time or without some discussion of the meaning of time [. . .] where some future time is envisaged and looked forward to.⁴

¹ For this and subsequent statistics regarding frequency of usage in the plays, I have used the concordance available at <http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/concordance/> [Last accessed 30.07.2013].

² Robert B. Bennett adds that 'In *1 Henry IV* [. . .] one encounters with much greater frequency than in the other three plays mention of specific days of the week and of other time-related words like *today*, *tomorrow*, and *business*.' ('Four Stages of Time: The Shape of History in Shakespeare's Second Tetralogy', *Shakespeare Studies*, 19 [1987], 61–85 [p. 84].)

³ It is noteworthy that, when clock time is mentioned, it always seems to be two o'clock: 'I think it be two o'clock' (2.1.32); 'I think it be two o'clock' (2.4.512); 'meet me [. . .] | At two o'clock' (3.3.199). The significance of this may be that it is an 'in-joke' about the start times of plays, in which case it is provocative, since it gestures towards 'real' time and so momentarily dislocates the audience from the fictionality of the play. Another significance of the specificity of 2 o'clock may be that it anticipates Hal's coronation, the only mention of 'o'clock', in *2 Henry IV*: "Twill be two o'clock ere they come from the coronation' (5.5.3-4). In this way the point at which Hal succeeds in 'redeeming time' (1.2.207) is precisely pinned down.

⁴ Paola Pugliatti, *Shakespeare the Historian* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996), p. 109.

From its outset the play presents a number of different approaches to time, revealed by characters' memories. Hal is adamant that the time should be ripe before what he has promised is fulfilled (for example, 3.2.144-6), while Hotspur is always resolute that to bring the future he desires into being, the time for action is now (for example, 2.3.32-3). Both are poised to claim the future: Hal is still waiting, while Hotspur is busy acting, but both engage with linear, chronological time. In direct contrast to them Falstaff refuses to have anything to do with 'the time of day' (1.2.6), and on the battlefield is quite prepared to give Hal a bottle of sack in place of a much-needed pistol. Hal rebukes Falstaff, retorting, 'What, is it a time to jest and dally now?' (4.3.56), but he fails to see that Falstaff's vitality comes not least from refusing to submit to the strictures of clock time, which has locked not only Hal and Hotspur, but also many others in the play, into performing the actions history demands of them. Falstaff uses memories to show that time must be as memories are - plural - if it is to allow release from the relentless tick-tock of the clock, and open up alternative modes of being. In this respect at least, Falstaff mirrors his maker, who demonstrates contempt for linear time in devoting the second tetralogy to events that precede those dramatized in the first tetralogy. In *Richard II* we saw how Richard's memories served to tie him into a set course of future action, and this afflicts Hal too. But Falstaff resists the idea that the past must always determine future actions and, thus released from the relentless pressure of time, his memories enable him - and the audience - to imagine an alternative future. Falstaff finds a way to break through the demands of history and to live unfettered by the weight of anything but his own bulk.

This chapter contributes to the fundamental argument of the whole thesis by showing how the characters' understanding and repetition of memories is intertwined with their perception of the significance of time. As I showed in Chapter 2, time is vital to memories, not least because its linearity leads characters back to their past but also allows for a future beyond their reach. In this chapter, I will develop my argument through a consideration of Hal, Hotspur and Falstaff, focusing on three of their speeches. The first section will offer a close reading of Hal's soliloquy at the start of the play (1.2) to show how he forecasts future memories and how his fixed notion of time binds him into becoming the Prince that history demands almost regardless of his own will. The second section will provide a reading of Hotspur's speech in the scene following Hal's (1.3), which sees Hotspur engaged in conjectural memories. Hotspur

wants to make sure that he and his allies are remembered as honourable and righteous. To this end he seeks to control future memories, but his anticipated memories also reveal how limited his sense of time is: his predictions and projections expose the fact that time has driven him to a rash course of action which waits for no one. The third section will examine Falstaff's story of the robbery (2.4) to show how his memories demonstrate his wayward concept of time. Falstaff's joyful playing with words puts the play on pause as he uses retrospective memories to jump-start a range of prospective thoughts. Memories reveal the characters' different understandings of time in the play; this in turn affects their conceptions of life and their place in their world. The characters' memories portray 'forces or arguments coming from opposite sides of the stage and meeting in mere oppugnancy.'⁵ In the case of Hal and Hotspur, their memories also betray 'the injuries' that 'a wanton time' (5.1.50) can impose on them.

Hal: 'Redeeming time' (1.2.185-207)

Hal's famous soliloquy at the end of the second scene of the play is an incisive demonstration of his relationship to time, and particularly to the future. But it is also the instance of forward recollection *par excellence* in the play, since Hal uses his speech to foreshadow future memories, and it establishes Hal's predestined end as the Prince who will 'throw off' his loose behaviour and his low-life companions. This also provides the opportunity to consider the ethical problems posed by remembering forwards, as it leads to questions about how much the characters of the second tetralogy are granted autonomy independent of their historical counterparts.

Hal's is the only verse soliloquy in the play. Other than three lines which are extrametrical or catalectic, the speech is delivered in orderly blank verse and is rounded off with a rhyming couplet, which makes its delivery appear measured and calculated. Hal's soliloquy expresses his confidence in his own fate, but I will show how in places the rhetoric of the speech reveals an undercurrent of ambiguity, confirming that it would be foolish to take this strange speech at face value. I quote it now in full:

I know you all, and will awhile uphold

⁵ Ricardo J. Quinones, 'Time and Historical Values in the Literature of the Renaissance', in *Aspects of Time*, ed. C. A. Patrides (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976), pp. 38-56 (p. 43).

The unyoked humour of your idleness.
 Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
 Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
 To smother up his beauty from the world,
 That, when he please again to be himself,
 Being wanted, he may be more wondered at
 By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
 Of vapours that did seem to strangle him.
 If all the year were playing holidays,
 To sport would be as tedious as to work;
 But when they seldom come, they wished-for come,
 And nothing pleaseth but rare accidents.
 So when this loose behaviour I throw off
 And pay the debt I never promised,
 By how much better than my word I am,
 By so much shall I falsify men's hopes;
 And like bright metal on a sullen ground,
 My reformation, glittering o'er my fault,
 Shall show more goodly and attract more eyes
 Than that which hath no foil to set it off.
 I'll so offend to make offence a skill,
 Redeeming time when men think least I will.

(1.2.185-207)

The main function of this speech is to excuse Hal's present conduct as a deliberate strategy, whose wisdom will be borne out by his future moral transformation when he becomes Henry V. Hal is trying to escape the fate of King Richard:

I wasted time, and now doth Time waste me;
 For now hath Time made me his numb'ring clock.
 My thoughts are minutes, and with sighs they jar
 Their watches on unto mine eyes, the outward watch,
 Whereto my finger, like a dial's point,
 Is pointing still, in cleansing them from tears.

(*Richard II*, 5.5.49-54)

Towards the end of his soliloquy Hal imagines his destiny, and justifies his current behaviour as a calculated delay of an already set future, thus escaping the accusation that he has 'wasted time', and, equally, avoiding the fate of time wasting him. Hal states that his ultimate 'purpose is a desire to escape the present; [this] arises from a vision of a future and [his] awareness of some possibility of realising that future.'⁶

⁶ Wylie Sypher, *The Ethic of Time: Structures of Experience in Shakespeare* (New York: Seabury Press, 1976), p. 39.

Robert Hapgood argues that 'the prince sees further ahead than anyone else in the play, and his is the dominant "voice" of the future',⁷ for better or worse. He continues,

all of his most important speeches are cast in the future tense, particularly his soliloquy (1.2.218-40) and his assurances to his father (3.2.129-59). Even his eulogies over Hotspur and Falstaff (5.4.87-110) move from the past tense through the present to the future.⁸

In fact, the soliloquy also contains sentences which are in the present tense. Indeed, the very first clause is in the present tense: 'I know you all' (l. 185). The form of this speech, delivered as it is in soliloquy, means that one cannot ignore the fact that Hal is directly addressing the audience, telling us that he knows us too. He implicates us with the Eastcheap crew whom he primarily has in mind. That the phrase is monosyllabic heightens its impact, as does the caesura that follows it and sets it apart.

The second sentence of the soliloquy sees the focus shift briefly from 'you' and 'your' to 'I', though the first-person pronoun mutates immediately into the third person:

Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
To smother up his beauty from the world,
That, when he please again to be himself,
Being wanted, he may be more wondered at
By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
Of vapours that did seem to strangle him.

The sentence has a noticeable variation in tense. The sentence begins with the future tense that we might expect for Hal's prophecy: 'Yet herein will I imitate the sun'. But in likening himself to the sun, Hal slips into the third-person singular present tense to describe metaphorically his current circumstances: he 'doth permit the base contagious clouds | To smother up his beauty from the world.' Likewise, 'Being wanted' fleetingly and figuratively reflects Hal's existing situation. The next two lines are 'By breaking through the foul and ugly mists | Of vapours that did seem to strangle him'. The second line has slipped into the past tense, and finally ends the idea that Hal is addressing the audience, since there is no sense in which the audience of the play can be seen as seeming to strangle Hal. Thus the equation of the audience with the

⁷ Robert Hapgood, 'Shakespeare's Thematic Modes of Speech: *Richard II* to *Henry V*', in *Shakespeare and Language*, ed. Catherine M. S. Alexander (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 142.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

Eastcheap crew collapses. Indeed, Hal's conversation appears to be with himself as the sun. Like Richard II, Hal is the audience of his own speech act. Even so, the qualification 'seem' is important: his companions are not *really* strangling him, but only *seem* to be. As far as Falstaff and his association with the prince are concerned, appearances certainly prove deceptive. The king may view Falstaff and his cronies as a pernicious influence (for example, 3.2.11-7), but they offer an important alternative understanding of time in the play, which, as its first lines indicate, is stifled by the weight of times dominated by 'frighted peace' and 'new broils' (1.1.2-3). Despite its diverse tenses, the overall effect of the sentence is forward recollection in action, an exposition of future memories: Hal will be the sun king who studies to be proficient 'with any tinker in his own language' (2.4.18) only in order to seem more glorious and radiant when he does become king. It is a memory likewise anticipated by Warwick in *2 Henry IV*, when he uses the same metaphor as Hal himself to reassure the king that:

The Prince but studies his companions
Like a strange tongue, wherein, to gain the language,
'Tis needful that the most immodest word
Be looked upon and learnt.

(4.4.68-71)

Warwick's confidence in Hal's plan is finally confirmed by the dialogue between the Bishops at the beginning of *Henry V*, when they discuss how far King Henry has come from the Hal of Eastcheap (1.1.24-66).

The extended metaphor that Hal employs in his soliloquy is a pathetic fallacy: the sun is not capable of intention or emotion; clouds are not 'base' and 'contagious', nor mists 'foul and ugly'. Yet the metaphor Hal has chosen is effective in suggesting how easily and effortlessly he will rid himself of the Eastcheap crew – as easily as the sun burns off the clouds that cover it in order to shine down all the more brightly by contrast. Yet the word 'imitate', which implies acting, confirms that all is not as it seems. Hal's likening of himself to the sun displays an exorbitant confidence in his own will and power, but there are hints of strain and ambiguity in the rhetoric.

The next sentence goes on to justify his strategy for making himself more 'wanted' (1.2.191) with an analogy:

If all the year were playing holidays,
To sport would be as tedious as to work;

But when they seldom come, they wish'd for come,
And nothing pleaseth but rare accidents.

The conditional conjunction 'If' is matched by the conditional tense of 'would be', which places emphasis on an action that would take place but also on the duration of that action, accentuating Hal's choice of 'all the year' to root his metaphor firmly in time. Finally Hal approaches the end of his speech:

So when this loose behaviour I throw off
And pay the debt I never promised,
By how much better than my word I am,
By so much shall I falsify men's hopes;
And like bright metal on a sullen ground,
My reformation, glitt'ring o'er my fault,
Shall show more goodly and attract more eyes
Than that which hath no foil to set it off.

'And pay the debt I never promised' is a striking line. Hal admits that this promise to fulfil his true responsibilities as king is not one of his making, but one that has been imposed on him. It is reminiscent of a child who, when told off for being naughty, complains that they never said they would be good. Hal does not ask to be king; it is expected of him, a promise made on his behalf and a debt incurred from birth, and one that he has absorbed almost unquestioningly – I say almost, because this one line reveals the conflicting undercurrents of the speech, the implications and incoherencies that disrupt or at least threaten its ostensibly unassailable logic and irresistible rhetoric. There is another use of the present tense in this sentence, which is subsequently in the future tense: Hal does not say 'By how much better than my word I'll be', but 'By how much better than my word I am' (l. 200), indicating that the Henry V of the future is already latent within him. The diverse tenses of the sentence mingle the promise of the future with which the rest of the speech is filled and the actualities of the present moment in which it is being delivered.

As he nears the concluding lines of the soliloquy, Hal rejects the metaphor and analogy of the previous lines in the speech. Instead, he employs an extended simile ('like bright metal...'), which makes the same point as the sun metaphor while putting himself firmly in control of it. Hal has resumed undeniable responsibility for his speech by using the first-person pronoun 'I' and the possessive determiner (adjective) 'my'. He retains the use of the former in the final rhyming couplet:

I'll so offend to make offence a skill,
Redeeming time when men think least I will.

What does 'Redeeming time' actually mean? It is often glossed by editors as meaning 'making up for wasted time'.⁹ In context, it is clear that Hal means that he will atone for time misspent in Eastcheap. Yet Paul Jorgensen makes a strong case for a different reading: he writes that 'to the Elizabethan audience, to redeem (or "rescue") time would be clearly understood as meaning to take full advantage of the time that man is given here on earth for salvation,'¹⁰ since it was referencing Ephesians 5.15-6.¹¹ Jorgensen's reading suggests that the overall meaning of the phrase is 'spending the present time well, not [. . .] trying to recover or atone for the time of days past.'¹² Thus, even Hal's apparently misspent days with his Eastcheap fellows must actually be a good use of his time. As David Scott Kastan writes, 'The histories [. . .] reveal time to be intractable stuff. It cannot be recalled.'¹³ But 'redeem' can also mean 'free or liberate',¹⁴ which would mean that Hal is acquitting his time of the constraints of what is expected of him, 'men's hopes' (l. 201). This has two potential interpretations. Either Hal is liberating himself from the court's expectations of him as prince in light of his shenanigans now, or he is liberating himself from their expectation that we will come to nothing by resolving to be a worthy prince later. However, every one of these four interpretations of 'Redeeming time' demands that Hal understands the court's concerns for the future and his place in it as heir to the throne. What Hal is patently not able to liberate himself from is that set destination; none of them refer to anything outside an already decided future.

⁹ For example Kastan, the Arden editor, 207n., p. 163. The editor of the Oxford Shakespeare, David Bevington, glosses it as 'buying back time' ([Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987], 205n., p. 144). The Cambridge editors also see that it could be interpreted as 'Paying back time [. . .] making amends for lost time' (Herbert Weil and Judith Weil [eds.], *The First Part of King Henry IV* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007], 177n., p. 102.).

¹⁰ Paul A. Jorgensen, *Redeeming Shakespeare's Words* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962), p. 59.

¹¹ 'Take heede therefore that yee walke circumspectly, not as fooles, but as wise, Redeeming ye season: for ye daies are euill.' (*The Geneva Bible, Facsimile 1560 Edition: The Bible of the Protestant Reformation* [Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007]).

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 59.

¹³ David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time* (Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New Hampshire, 1982), p. 55.

¹⁴ David Crystal and Ben Crystal, *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary and Language Companion* (London: Penguin, 2002), p. 366.

Herbert and Judith Weil notice that ‘the Prince’s speech operates “before and after” [. . .]. It furnishes one of several moments when the play appears to pivot on a fulcrum.’¹⁵ Hal’s desire to redeem the time means that he projects future memories, but this reliance on linear intervals, whether ‘before’ or ‘after’, shows how fixed his notion of time is. The ‘fulcrum’ on which the play pivots appears in this analysis to be the point round which the hands of a clock revolve. Hal’s choice of words demonstrates the difficulty of escaping a future fixed by his insistence on ‘weigh[ing] time | Even to the utmost grain’ (*Henry V*, 2.4.137-8).

Finally, I want to comment on the phrase ‘I will’ with which the speech closes. It suggests a resolve to be the master of one’s own destiny; the words mean not only ‘I shall do this’, but the performative injunction that ‘I will this to be so’. Severely chastised by his father for his base company in Eastcheap and unfavourable comparisons to Hotspur, in Act 3 Hal promises to ‘be more myself’ (3.2.93). Likewise, he promises to ‘redeem all this on Percy’s head | And in the closing of some glorious day | Be bold to tell you that I am your son’ (ll. 132-4, my emphasis). When Hal confronts his father in 3.2 he closes his speeches with five repetitions of the phrase ‘I will’ (ll. 132, 135, 149, 152, 158), which may remind us of the ‘I will’ with which he finishes his soliloquy, and, more ominously, the ‘I will’ with which he finishes the play extempore (2.4.468). John Lawlor writes of ‘I do, I will’ that ‘in these four words, present and future are one.’¹⁶

In this speech Hal has orchestrated for himself an escape from the jaws of a fate of ‘idleness’, smothered ‘beauty’, strangulation and ‘loose behaviour’, by denying ‘the soul of every man | [who does] [p]rophetically [. . .] forethink [his] fall’ (3.2.38). Hal attempts to control his own destiny by promising ‘bright metal’, ‘reformation’, goodness and redemption, so as to deny the prediction of the times, while concurrently fulfilling his unwritten or unspoken obligations to ‘real’ history. But Hal escapes the prophecy about himself spoken by others in the play only by making one of his own: that he will redeem the time when men think least he will (1.2.207). It is not an authentic deliverance from prediction, since he forges his own. And the result

¹⁵ Weil and Weil (eds), *The First Part of Henry IV*, p. 11.

¹⁶ John Lawlor, *Tragic Sense in Shakespeare* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1960), p. 31. It would be churlish not to acknowledge the monumental work of John Langshaw Austin, who discusses the performative nature of the phrase ‘I will’ with reference to the marriage ceremony in *How to Do Things With Words*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2005), Lecture III, pp. 25-38.

of his own redemption is the fall of Falstaff and Co., the 'sullen ground' and 'offence' of his present time, which bestows upon Hal's redemption a bitter taste and makes it subject to a codicil.

In some ways the audience has been prepared for this extended consideration of the future in Hal's soliloquy by our memories of what we have seen previously in this scene, where Hal and Falstaff have had exchanges that eerily anticipate what is to come in the rest of the play. Falstaff's statement that 'thou hast done much harm upon me Hal; God forgive thee for it' (ll. 88-9) followed by 'I must give over this life, and I will give it over' (l. 92) and then 'I'll be a traitor then, when you art king' (ll. 138-9) adumbrates Falstaff's casting off at the end of *2 Henry IV* and his death at the beginning of *Henry V*. Falstaff's request 'Do not, when thou art king, hang a thief' (l. 59) anticipates Bardolph's death at the gallows in *Henry V* (3.6.38-40).¹⁷

The announcement of Hal's overall project in this soliloquy ensures that forward recollection works in this play and into the next play as we await the inevitable denouement promised by the principal protagonist. As with the examples of forward recollection I chose from *Richard II*, no knowledge of how the play will conclude is required by the audience, since the prediction is declared by the character. Hal's speech is important in showing how he – and now the audience – can view his exchanges with Falstaff as premonitions of an inevitable and gloomy conclusion: Falstaff's dismissal. Knowing the future places quite a strain on the audience: we may enjoy Falstaff's witticisms and folly, but we know that they are only ephemeral. Those who know the tetralogy already hear in 'I know you all' chilling echoes of 'I know thee not' spoken to Falstaff at the close of the next play (*2H4*, 5.5.47). Pugliatti observes that 'Time is finally redeemed'¹⁸ for Hal at the close of *2 Henry IV*, but only at the expense of the comic plot.

In *1 Henry IV*, does unconsciously knowing the future make it happen? Does thinking it enact it? The problem with forward recollection in this case is that it has closed off other prospects by seeing the future as already written and decided; tasked with fulfilling the prophecies of *1 Henry IV*, it is little wonder that *2 Henry IV* strikes a

¹⁷ The Arden edition which I have taken as my default text has adopted the spelling 'Bardoll' for this character (see pp. 123-4 of that edition for the editor's explanation). However, due to my own preference, and to maintain consistency with the Arden edition of *2 Henry IV*, which uses the more usual 'Bardolph', I too use 'Bardolph' throughout my thesis.

¹⁸ Pugliatti, *Shakespeare the Historian*, p. 126.

more sombre note. Within the world of both plays, all the events unfolding for the characters have already unfolded for their historical counterparts. The characters of the play are set on a course of action determined by their situation and by the repetition of history itself within the play: in Quinones's words, 'the predictive face of time almost thoroughly eclipses the innovative'.¹⁹

The play makes the case that we are tied into our times and contexts, but even if the characters' futures have already occurred, the audience's future has not, so the possibility of change is still available. As a historical figure, Hal's future has already been written; but as a human being in the 'real time' of the play, it remains open to change. If only he could see it,

a remnant of freedom [is] still available to Hal. The structure of the play, with its multiple plot levels [. . .] reminds us that we still live in the realm of choice. The past has not so far constrained him that he is committed to a single line of behaviour.²⁰

Yet it seems to be the audience who grasp this, rather than Hal. If 'it might have been possible to seize the "time" in some other way',²¹ Hal betrays no hint that he is aware of it, but trudges doggedly towards a foregone conclusion. Thus the play demonstrates and warns of the dangers and trouble of forward recollection, and shows the consequences of the fulfilment of prophecies, while suggesting to the audience that alternatives might be available. It is not only that our future has not yet been written, but that the form of the play itself encourages us to think beyond the closed type of time that Hal envisages: the arbitrariness of the points at which the play opens and closes confirms the fact that time flows freely both before and after it; Shakespeare emphasises the incompleteness of any action. As a character within the play, Hal is not able to see this 'formal principle of the work'²² in the way that the audience is. 'The histories' open-ended structures make us confront our fragile existence as "time's subjects" (2H4, 1.3.120) released into a world of contingency and flux.'²³ The play also provides a living, walking, talking embodiment of that 'contingency and flux' in the

¹⁹ Quinones, 'Time and Historical Values in the Literature of the Renaissance', p. 55.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

²¹ Agnes Heller, 'Time and Space: Past-orientedness and Future-orientedness', in *Renaissance Man* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978), pp. 170-96 (p. 174).

²² Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time*, p. 9.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

person of Falstaff, who, unhindered by a historical counterpart,²⁴ is far freer than his fellows to make his own future, as I will discuss in Section 3 below.

Hotspur: 'If life did ride upon a dial's point' (5.2.83)

Hotspur is just as mindful of time as Hal. Jorgensen contends that:

Hotspur [. . .] is driven by a passionate time consciousness. He wonders how his father has the leisure to be sick. He pleads with his fellow rebels: 'yet time serves wherein you may redeem | Your banish'd honours' (*1H4*, 1.3.180-1). As he approaches the moment of his death he achieves some of the finest perceptions in the play on the subject of time. There is his anguished, but theologically warranted, exclamation: [the time of life is short...]²⁵

As has already been mentioned, Hal and Hotspur share the similar desire to 'redeem time' (compare 1.2.207 and 1.3.179-81), and thus both are focused on their future goals. Given Hal's likening of himself to the sun early in the play, it would be apt if 'dial' in Hotspur's 'dial's point' meant 'sundial', but it must mean 'clock face' because, as David Scott Kastan comments, 'the gnomon of a sundial does not move, while Hotspur imagines life riding on the 'point' to the 'arrival of an hour', [l.] 84.'²⁶ It may be helpful to repeat the distinction between Hal's and Hotspur's perception of time, which I observed in Chapter 2 when discussing time as it was understood in the Renaissance. Aeschylean time imputes an ethical meaning to passing time, bringing retribution for wrongs committed. Hal's soliloquy is a perfect example of seeing time as a harbinger of justice. But in this speech, Hotspur betrays a sense of time which is more Sophoclean: time is not an agent of justice, but shows the insecurities of life:

O gentlemen, the time of life is short;
To spend that shortness basely were too long
If life did ride upon a dial's point,
Still ending at the arrival of an hour.
(5.2.81-4)

²⁴ I am discounting his identification as the Puritan martyr Oldcastle for reasons explained in Section 3, below.

²⁵ Jorgensen, *Redeeming Shakespeare's Words*, p. 53.

²⁶ Scott Kastan (ed.), *1 Henry IV*, 5.2.83.n., p. 318.

This concept is then developed by Hotspur who, as he dies, sees time an agent of chance, fortune or fate, to which we all fall victim: 'thoughts, the slave of life, and life, time's fool' (5.4.80).

So though they share a contemplation of the future, Hal and Hotspur differ in how they envisage time itself, and thus in how they respond to the demands time places on them. Hotspur is far more proactive in achieving his goals than Hal, and works tirelessly every moment to bring about the future he wants. Hal sees his future clearly in his soliloquy at the start of the play, but waits patiently for the right time to act. Hal himself mocks Hotspur's constant action in the tavern scene with Poins (2.4.90-106), but later confesses how much he admires it (5.1.85-95). And in *2 Henry IV*, Hal could be impersonating Hotspur when he exclaims, 'By heaven, Poins, I feel me much to blame | So idly to profane the precious time' (2.4.358-9).

Hotspur's seemingly inexhaustible energy is at least partly a result of his perception of time. It is clear in the lines 5.2.81-4 (quoted above) that Hotspur's sense of time is tied to his sense of honour – spending time 'basely' is wrong when life rides 'upon a dial's point'. To show this more fully I want to offer a close reading of a part of 1.3. The speech is in the scene directly after Hal's soliloquy, and thus invites immediate comparison with what has come before. The speech I have chosen is a mixture of actual memories (of what has happened in the past) in the first half, and potential future memories in the second half; it is the second half that makes evident Hotspur's concept of time. These prospective memories reveal his eagerness to seize the time now, even if it is not yet ripe. Hotspur has just learned from Worcester and Northumberland that Mortimer was proclaimed next in line to the throne by King Richard, and that prompts his speech:

Nay, then I cannot blame his cousin King
That wished him on the barren mountains starve.
But shall it be that you that set the crown
Upon the head of this forgetful man
And for his sake wear the detested blot
Of murderous subornation – shall it be
That you a world of curses undergo,
Being the agents or base second means,
The cords, the ladder, or the hangman rather?
O pardon me that I descend so low
To show the line and the predicament
Wherein you range under this subtle King!

Shall it for shame be spoken in these days,
Or fill up chronicles in time to come,
That men of your nobility and power
Did gage them both in an unjust behalf
(As both of you, God pardon it, have done)
To put down Richard, that sweet lovely rose,
And plant this thorn, this canker, Bolingbroke?
And shall it in more shame be further spoken
That you are fooled, discarded and shook off
By him for whom these shames ye underwent?
No! Yet time serves wherein you may redeem
Your banished honours and restore yourselves
Into the good thoughts of the world again,
Revenge the jeering and disdained contempt
Of this proud King, who studies day and night
To answer all the debt he owes to you
Even with the bloody payment of your deaths.
(1.3.157-85)

With his opening two lines Hotspur begins a series of references to King Henry IV throughout the speech. He is first a 'cousin King' (l. 157), with an obvious play on 'cozen', then a 'forgetful man' (l. 160), guilty of not remembering who his friends were that made him king, then a 'subtle King' (l. 168), then simply 'Bolingbroke', stripped of his title (l. 175), and finally a 'proud King' (l. 183). Hotspur's first two lines remember the King's own words moments earlier when he proclaimed that Mortimer should be left 'on the barren mountains' to starve (1.3.89). But his memories quickly turn into a type of prophecy:

But shall it be that you that set the crown
Upon the head of this forgetful man
And for his sake wear the detested blot
Of murderous subornation – shall it be
That you a world of curses undergo,
Being the agents or base second means,
The cords, the ladder, or the hangman rather?

The two 'shall it be that you' statements in this part of the speech are followed by two 'shall it be for shame' statements in the parts that follow (ll. 169 and 176), all of which confirm that Hotspur is thinking of a future time. But of course, they 'set the crown | Upon the head of this forgetful man' in the past, and are wearing 'the detested blot | Of murderous subornation' in the present, so temporal conflation is once again present in this speech. 'The cords' are related to 'the hangman'; the reference to 'the

hangman' may also remind the audience of Falstaff as hangman, mentioned in the previous scene (1.2.63-5). The order of the objects mentioned is interesting. Hotspur's focuses in close-up on the cord, and then pans out to the ladder and finally the hangman. He grapples for the right object for his metaphor, finally settling on the person responsible for the deed as opposed to the inanimate objects of cords or ladder; but in doing so he is also painting a far larger, more comprehensive image of their role in the deposition. In the next three lines Hotspur finally returns to himself, rather than reflecting on his father and uncle, with the words:

O pardon me that I descend so low
To show the line and the predicament
Wherein you range under this subtle King!

The 'cords' and 'hangman' are again obliquely echoed in 'the line and predicament' (l. 167), where 'line' can be both 'degree' and 'rope', and 'predicament' can be 'dangerous situation' as well as 'category'. But no sooner has Hotspur shown how his relatives 'range' – both 'stray' and 'are ranked' – in the present, than he zooms back to harking on the future:

Shall it for shame be spoken in these days,
Or fill up chronicles in time to come,
That men of your nobility and power
Did gage them both in an unjust behalf
(As both of you, God pardon it, have done)
To put down Richard, that sweet lovely rose,
And plant this thorn, this canker, Bolingbroke?

The phrase 'fill up chronicles in time to come' speaks of future memories, and continues a series of overt references to time which runs to the conclusion of the speech (others include, for example, 'days' [l. 169], 'time' [l. 179], and 'day and night' [l. 183]). Hotspur once again excludes himself from judgement by the parenthesis of line 173, but fails to use titles either for Richard or for Bolingbroke, choosing instead to use their Christian names, putting them on an equal footing as men. As I showed in the last chapter, titles are significant for memory; by choosing not to use them, Hotspur lowers their argument to one without a royal prerogative. He refers to Richard as a 'sweet lovely rose' and to Bolingbroke as a 'canker' - both 'dog-rose' and 'ulcer'. This metaphor might remind those who know *Richard II* of the gardening scene in that play

(3.4), although in Hotspur's analysis Richard is the sweet flower and Bolingbroke the weed, whereas in *Richard II* it was the other way around. For any reader or spectator who knows both plays, the relevance of the passage of time to revealing things as they truly are (in other words, the benefit of hindsight,) is implicit here. Hotspur continues to imagine the gossip, slanders and rumours of the future, predicting 'further' speech with 'more shame':

And shall it in more shame be further spoken
That you are fooled, discarded and shook off
By him for whom these shames ye underwent?

We have reached the end of the speech and Hotspur finally spells out the destination to which he has been striding all this while. He insists that these future memories can be forestalled by seizing the present 'time' in which they may 'redeem', 'restore' and 'revenge' themselves:

No! Yet time serves wherein you may redeem
Your banished honours and restore yourselves
Into the good thoughts of the world again,
Revenge the jeering and disdained contempt
Of this proud King, who studies day and night
To answer all the debt he owes to you
Even with the bloody payment of your deaths.

In this part of the speech Hotspur does engage with the Aeschylean interpretation of time, as Hal did in his soliloquy, since Hotspur encourages his father and uncle to allow the passage of time to give them the opportunity to atone for injuries they have committed. The difference between Hal and Hotspur is that Hal wants this type of future for himself, whereas Hotspur seeks it for others. Hotspur circuitously imagines the wheel of fortune turning, allowing his relatives to rise to the top again ('the good thoughts of the world').

One's death repays a debt to God (Falstaff uses the same metaphor at 5.1.126-8), but here Hotspur envisages Bolingbroke using all the time available to him – 'day and night' - to pay his debt through *others'* deaths, specifically Worcester's and Northumberland's, rather than his own. The key to this speech is revealed here in its closing lines: it is not a coincidence that Hotspur uses the same terms as Hal, 'redeem' in particular, and even the metaphor of 'debt' and 'payment' (ll. 184-5). The key phrase

here is that 'time serves' (l. 179, my emphasis). '[S]erves' can mean straightforwardly 'provides or supplies the opportunity' to redeem their 'banished honours', but it can also mean 'suffice', so that time will 'be enough' for them to redeem themselves.²⁷ Equally, it can also mean 'render service', as if time was at their command, or the opposite, 'allow' or 'afford', as if time were in command. Hotspur's actions through the play indicate that he believes he can control time to his advantage (the former definition), but at his death he acknowledges the contrary, that life is 'time's fool' (5.4.80) (the latter definition). Hotspur finally realises that 'the destructive action of time frustrates heroic attainment.'²⁸

Hotspur's impatience to write the future so as to redeem 'banished honours' demonstrates his sense of time being inextricably tied to reputation, in this instance that of his allies, but by extension also to his own. His imagination is so strong that it leads him to want that reputation in an instant:

By heaven, methinks it were an easy leap
To pluck bright honour from the pale-faced moon,
Or dive into the bottom of the deep,
Where fathom-line could never touch the ground,
And pluck up drowned honour by the locks,
So he that doth *redeem* her thence might wear,
Without corrival, all her dignities.

(1.3.200-6, my emphasis)

Again Hotspur seems to be in control of his tenses; after 'were', all the verbs are in the infinitive. But Worcester's response to Hotspur is telling: 'He apprehends a world of figures here | But not the form of what he should attend' (1.3.208-9). Hotspur's emotion mars the lessons he might learn from memories. His passion for writing the future in the present is an obstacle to 'turning past evil to advantages' (2H4, 4.4.78). Indeed, Hotspur's impassioned delivery of this speech and others like it in the scene, and his refusal to listen to any sort of considered reason, lead his own father to exclaim that 'Imagination of some great exploit | Drives him beyond the bounds of patience' (1.3.198-9). The King's request for Hotspur's prisoners and the King's refusal to ransom Mortimer lead to Hotspur's outburst in this scene, but his indignant anger is

²⁷ These definitions and those that follow are taken from Crystal and Crystal, *Shakespeare's Words*, p. 393.

²⁸ Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time*, p. 58.

indicative of a personality which waits on no man - in this case for his uncle's important news and message - nor for a time which will serve for his task.

At the close of 1.3 Worcester tells Hotspur that only 'When time is ripe' (l. 289) will he go to Glendower and Mortimer, and there meet with the armies of Douglas and his allies. Hotspur's reply, predictably enough, is, 'O, let the hours be short | Till fields and blows and groans applaud our sport' (ll. 196-7). Hotspur clearly does not share Hal's perception that 'If all the year were playing holidays, | To sport would be as tedious as to work' (1.2.194-5), since he longs for the 'holiday' of 'sport' (battle) and wishes away the intervening hours.

Later in the play, when Hotspur receives a letter from a supposed ally, saying he will not join the rebels because 'The purpose you undertake is dangerous, the friends you have named uncertain, the time itself unsorted' (2.3.9-11), Hotspur insists that from danger will come safety (2.3.7-9), and that the friends he has are certain (2.3.16, 18), but to the charge of an 'unsorted time' he offers no come-back, only a statement that fixes his action on a specific time, 'the ninth of the next month' (2.3.25-6). He ends his soliloquy in a rage, insisting 'I will set forward tonight. How now, Kate? I must leave you within these two hours' (2.3.33-5). Even if Hotspur does not reflect on or recognise the attitude to time he displays in his speeches, that attitude demands that he act in the present for the future in a way that insists he himself, his reputation and his honour, must come first. In Othello's words, he looks for 'big wars | That makes ambition virtue'.²⁹ It is certain that Hotspur uses his knowledge of the past and his memories of it in order to inform his attitude to the present – in a final flourish, his long re-telling of the *Richard II* story in 4.3.52-105 assures the audience of this – but he is so fixated on creating a future of his own making, thrusting himself headlong into the imminent time he craves, that he allows himself literally no time to stop and reflect on the rashness of his actions. Hotspur's failure to read the letters on the morning of the battle of Shrewsbury is another illustration of his impetuosity (5.2.80). It is only at his death in that battle that he finally realises the greater truth, that 'thoughts, the slaves of life, and life, time's fool, | And time, that takes survey of all the world, | Must have a stop' (5.4.80-2). This is evidence of the ultimate failure of Hotspur's mode of engagement with memories and time. Kastan writes that 'in an age in which heroic

²⁹ William Shakespeare, *Othello*, ed. E. A. J. Honigman, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning: 1997), 3.3.352-3. I acknowledge that Othello is speaking of the past and his loss of these things, but I am using the analogy because of its idea that battle somehow makes ambition virtuous.

virtue has grown increasingly anomalous, it serves only to close off the present’;³⁰ ultimately, Hotspur runs out of the very time he relied on to bring about his desired future. He is even unable to finish his last sentence before he dies (5.4.85), and cannot use his memories, which dictate his concept of time and his present actions, to launch a viable future for himself.

Falstaff: ‘What a devil hast thou to do with the time of day?’ (1.2.5-6)

I said in the conclusion of my section on Hal that Falstaff is not hindered by a historical counterpart; what I mean is that Falstaff is an ‘unhistorical intruder’.³¹ No matter how much scholars squabble about Fastolf and Oldcastle, Falstaff is not recorded in the chronicles and annals in the way that Hal or Bolingbroke or even Hotspur are. Geoffrey Bullough insists that ‘Falstaff cannot be regarded as an amalgam of two Fastolfs and the fictitious Oldcastle.’³² Even if Falstaff has fixed points of reference, he is still detached from the ‘real’ past of written history in a way that other characters in the play could never be, distanced from English history by being a fictional character, not a historical one. Shakespeare reinforces this distinction by resurrecting Falstaff for the fictional play *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Yet it is precisely this that frees Falstaff to disclose another history, a history which has far more to do with Gadshill and Francis than it has to do with Hal and Hotspur. As Nigel Wood remarks, ‘whereas the historical characters are weighty, carrying between them the burden of the plot, Falstaff is light, moving freely around and across’ the plays and beyond the tetralogy.³³ Falstaff shows that it is possible to record the ‘other side’ of things, a history separate from the annals of Kings. If history is a hollow shell, waiting to be filled with the memories of what ‘actually’ happened, Falstaff offers an alternative ‘actuality’. As Kastan points out, Sly in *The Taming of the Shrew* is told that comedy ‘is a kind of history’ (Induction 2.135).³⁴ And so it is with Falstaff, whose jests conceal a sort of history. In his provenance, then, Falstaff is already unlike Hal and Hotspur. Falstaff’s dynamic difference from those

³⁰ Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time*, p. 22.

³¹ H. B. Charlton, ‘Shakespeare, Politics and Politicians’ (1929) in *King Henry IV Parts 1 and 2*, ed. G. K. Hunter (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1970), p. 87.

³² Geoffrey Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, Volume 4, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960), p. 172. For a contrasting view see Alice Lyle Scoufos, ‘The Martyrdom of Falstaff’, *Shakespeare Studies*, 2 (1966), 174-91.

³³ Nigel Wood (ed.), *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995), p. 145.

³⁴ Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time*, p. 7.

around him is only further confirmed when we consider his relationship to memories and time.

If Falstaff eludes history as understood by Hal and Hotspur, in doing so he also evades time, since, in the words of Agnes Heller, 'whoever wishes to escape from [. . .] time must escape from history.'³⁵ Through memories, Falstaff discloses a different notion of history but also of life, which is not necessarily based on clock time. For example, the first words we ever hear Falstaff speak are when he asks Hal 'what time of the day is it?' (1.2.1). Falstaff asks a run-of-the-mill question which asks for little more than an automatic reply, much like the question 'How are you?' which results in the reply 'Fine' even if the person speaking the answer is having a bad day. But Hal latches onto the question and replies:

Thou hast forgotten to demand that truly which thou wouldst truly know.
What a devil hast thou to do with the time of the day? Unless hours were cups
of sack, and minutes capons, and clocks the tongues of bawds, and dials the
signs of leaping houses, and the blessed sun himself a fair hot wench in flame-
coloured taffeta, I see no reason why thou shouldst be so superfluous to
demand the time of the day.

(1.2.4-11)

Hal gives voice to the materialism that governs the way Falstaff lives his life. He lists a veritable cornucopia of nouns, 'things' that Falstaff enjoys: 'cups of sack', 'capons', 'tongues of bawds', 'signs of leaping houses', 'a fair hot wench.' His accusation that 'Thou hast forgotten to demand that truly which thou wouldst truly know' is confirmed by Falstaff's riposte: 'Indeed, you come near me now, Hal' (1.2.12), emphasising their proximity of place ('near me') as opposed to time. Like Bolingbroke in the first scene of the play, Falstaff is another old man, but he cues his own Falstaffian time, which is measured only by the gratification of fleshly appetites. Lawrence Danson puts it eloquently: 'Falstaff eats time and screws the instruments of its measurement'.³⁶ Let not Falstaff's age and white beard deceive us into thinking him akin to Father Time, roaming through the plays with one eye on the clock; he meets occasions as they arise and uses them to the best advantage – for himself, of course.

W. H. Auden contends that 'for Falstaff, time does not exist, since he belongs to the *opera buffa* world of play and mock action governed not by will or desire, but by

³⁵ Heller, *Renaissance Man*, p. 188.

³⁶ Lawrence Danson, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Genres* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 97.

innocent wish, a world where no one can suffer because everything he says or does is only a pretense.’³⁷ I would modify Auden’s statement to say that the concept of time Falstaff does have is at odds with Hal’s and Hotspur’s and that of almost anyone else in the courtly world of the play, since it is not based on the clock but on when his belly is empty, his mouth is dry, or his bed is cold. Thus he can be ‘old Jack’ (for example 2.4.121-2; 180-1 and *passim*) but also ‘youth’ (2.2.83, 88). He can be what he wants to be, because he is not tied to time. However, I do not want to mimic those critics who see this but then explain it away as a ‘Bakhtinian chronotope of carnival.’³⁸ This does Falstaff a disservice, and to show why, I want to turn now to 2.4, particularly Falstaff’s recounting of the robbery (ll. 111-272). My consideration of this scene will show how Falstaff’s relationship with time becomes obvious through his manipulation of memories.

Falstaff’s story of the robbery committed with Gadshill, Bardolph and Peto is an act of wilful misremembering akin to that of Mowbray and Bolingbroke in *Richard II*, 1.1. Put another way, Falstaff’s lies are selective memories which relate the past as he wants it to be remembered. Yet Falstaff’s memories cannot even agree with themselves: first there are ‘two rogues in buckram suits’ (2.4.185-6), then there are four (l. 188), then seven (l. 194), then nine (l. 205), and finally eleven (l. 211). Each pseudo-memory is given its own space and time and telling. Falstaff’s corpulence corresponds to the fecundity of his memories which, as if germinated by his imagination, breed ‘buckram men’ (l. 212) – as Hal puts it, ‘we shall have more anon’ (ll. 200-1).³⁹ The ‘monstrous’ (l. 212) multiplication of Falstaff’s adversaries tells how things might have been in some alternative reality: the effect of Falstaff’s tall tale is to keep at the forefront of the audience’s mind the frequently huge gap between what is told as history and what actually occurred. But as Ricardo Quinones has pointed out, the sense of change that Falstaff imposes on his story could also have another effect: it

³⁷ W. H. Auden, “‘The Prince’s Dog’ (1959)”, in *King Henry IV Parts 1 and 2*, ed. Hunter, p. 188.

³⁸ Nicholas Grene, *Shakespeare’s Serial History Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 209.

³⁹ Because of Hal’s gulling of Francis, the word ‘anon’ is present more times in *1 Henry IV* than in any other play of the canon. Used here against Falstaff, it hints at procrastination, which delays or defers the present time in order to cultivate alternatives. Falstaff’s prorogation (for example, ‘Watch tonight, pray tomorrow [2.4.268-9]) is akin to the Augustinian plea, ‘Give me chastity and continence, but not yet’ (Saint Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. and intro. R. S. Pine Coffin [London: Penguin, 1961], Book 8, Section 7, p. 169), in that it privileges the satisfaction of bodily desires over their subjugation.

'leads to a redemption of present things in all their materiality and passingness.'⁴⁰ Falstaff's life, lived so viscerally in the present moment, is in striking contrast to the life lived by Hal or Hotspur, who gaze at the future without enabling it to be anything other than they expect. They seem to look forward but are held back by their concept of time, which means that they constantly hear – and fear – the tick-tock of the clock, hands moving, and minutes passing. If 'mechanical clocks [. . .] mark the moment-by-moment annihilation of the present',⁴¹ by refusing to listen to them Falstaff ironically is able to live a *carpe diem* lifestyle, which (likewise ironically) releases the possibility of a vitally different future. There is a succession of associations here: Falstaff's memories of the past (for example 2.4.320-3) link to his instinctive life in the present (for example, 'Watch tonight, pray tomorrow' [2.4.268-9] and 'Give me life' [5.3.60]), which in turn links to the future-orientedness of which Heller writes:

Living in the present none the less presupposes a certain kind of orientation towards the future. [. . .] an attitude of 'facing towards the future', an alertness to the stirrings of the future, its evolution, and its possibilities. [. . .] Men do not attend to what is but rather to what will be or might be. That, too, is a prerequisite for 'seizing the moment'.⁴²

Being the least tied to time, Falstaff has the most fluid notion of time. Falstaff's time is as plural as his memories, and is thus never closed off or closed down, but rather open to adjustment, amendment and alteration, like a rehearsal. Falstaff's story about the robbery imagines alternatives to the way things really went for him, and in doing so ignites the idea that things could be otherwise for the audience too. After all, 'a sense of time can only exist where there is a submission to reality.'⁴³ This is part of Falstaff's appeal for audiences, a feeling which may even be unacknowledged, that to live life so unfettered by 'the state of time' (4.1.25) is enormously liberating, life-giving, and fun. Falstaff's vitality and footloose way of life show an utter contempt for the lessons of yesterday, the needs of today, and the demands of tomorrow. If you have no worries for tomorrow, what need is there to reflect on or learn from yesterday? Or in Falstaff's words, 'What need I be so forward with him that calls not on me?' (5.1.128-9). At least in his own estimation, Falstaff's future is as open to change as his past is.

⁴⁰ Quinones, 'Time and Historical Values in the Literature of the Renaissance', p. 50.

⁴¹ Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time*, p. 5.

⁴² Heller, *Renaissance Man*, p. 195.

⁴³ Paul Fraisse, *The Psychology of Time* (London: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 163.

It is telling that Falstaff uses clock time to give his lies specificity – he fought ‘two hours together’ (2.4.159) with the men in buckram. He uses the same trick at Shrewsbury, where he swears he ‘fought a long hour by Shrewsbury clock’ (5.4.148). Clock time is so inconsequential to Falstaff, but so important to others, that he has cottoned on to the obvious way to make his tales more plausible – assign them a specific duration and it will make them all the more believable. It is an idea akin to the thought that observing the neoclassical unity of time in drama makes it more credible.

Hal himself longs to ‘drive away the time till Falstaff come’ (2.4.27), as if it were the only thing to live for, as if time moves slowly until Falstaff comes. Yet despite this, and perhaps unsurprisingly considering his own relationship to time, it is Hal who insists on a ‘plain tale’ (2.4.248), on restoring an accurate version of events (2.4.246-57). It is to Hal’s credit that he does not repeat this insistence at the battle of Shrewsbury, but instead allows Falstaff to be the ‘double man’ (5.4.138) – ‘if a lie may do thee grace | I’ll gild it with the happiest terms I have’ (5.4.157-8).

Falstaff is a precursor of Rumour in *Part Two*, who breeds stories, ‘Stuffing the ears of men with false reports’ (Induction 8). Like Falstaff, Rumour rewrites history according to his own twisted memories, which again are inconsistent with each other, first speaking of ‘King Harry’s victory’ (Induction 23), and then of the king who ‘Stoop’d his anointed head as low as death’ (Induction 31-2). Yet unlike Falstaff, Rumour’s existence is helped, not hindered, by the characters’ relationships with time. Even in *2 Henry IV* the characters are more often than not tied in a limiting way to past, present and future. On receiving the first message, Northumberland notes that ‘Every minute now | Should be the father of some stratagem. | The times are wild’ (2H4, 1.117-9).⁴⁴ In one breath Northumberland speaks of the possibility of subjective time (‘the times [plural] are wild’) while at once tying it to objective time (‘every minute’). He too is locked into an understanding of events which is based on the clock. For Pugliatti, ‘The implication is clear: what has already been told about this story – in the first play of the sequence – may have suffered from falsification, and may therefore stand in need of revision.’⁴⁵

The play extempore which immediately follows Falstaff’s story of the robbery is also important in terms of memory, since it is in fact a rehearsal, an event that may

⁴⁴ For a consideration of time in *2 Henry IV* see Benjamin T. Spencer, ‘*2 Henry IV* and the Theme of Time’, *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 13 (1944), 394-99.

⁴⁵ Pugliatti, *Shakespeare the Historian*, p. 107.

have been previously played and will almost certainly be played again in the future.⁴⁶ Falstaff asks Hal to 'practise an answer' (2.4.365), and thus the actors play characters who play actors. In his soliloquy in 1.2 Hal implies that he is a performer in continual rehearsal for a role, which he proceeds to carry off across three plays. In the play extempore he proves just how successful an actor he can be. He is a far better king than Falstaff, who is at best a comic actor – appropriately so, since he may have been played by Will Kemp.⁴⁷ Hal's final chilling words in the play extempore – 'I do; I will' (2.4.468) confirm that 'The consuming rhythms of tragedy close off the action with terrible decisiveness and finality',⁴⁸ whereas Falstaff's role both in the play extempore and in *1 Henry IV* demonstrates that 'the inclusive action of comedy opens out with the promise of renewal and continuity.'⁴⁹

Falstaff's false memories, one corrected, one allowed; Rumour's false memories in *Part Two*; and the play extempore's overt engagement with the metatheatrical; all in their own way ask one crucial question: can these memories be believed? They all show how easy it is to tell a revised version of events which is inaccurate. Mistress Quickly remarks of Falstaff, 'O Jesu, he doth it as like one of these harlotry players as ever I see!' (2.4.385-6), because, in fact, the actor playing Falstaff *is* a 'harlotry player'. The memories I have discussed in this section spell out the fact that what happened in the past does not necessarily correspond to what is presented before us. The play extempore, because it is a metadramatic incident in the play, promotes an attitude of scepticism towards plays in general, as well as historical tales in particular. It posits a problematic memory of what happened in time; as Kiernan Ryan observes, 'The conscious theatricality of this parodic performance highlights both the rootlessness of the roles and the staged nature of the historical realities being burlesqued.'⁵⁰ The audience is asked not only to question the memories of the characters in the play, but the veracity of the play before them.

⁴⁶ The French for 'rehearsal' is 'répétition', which emphasises this still further.

⁴⁷ Nicholas Grene neatly summarises the arguments for and against in *Shakespeare's Serial History Plays*, p. 209.

⁴⁸ Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time*, p. 9.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁵⁰ Kiernan Ryan, 'The Future of History: 1 and 2 Henry IV', in *Shakespeare*, 3rd edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 38-66 (p. 51).

Jonathan Baldo calls Falstaff 'a walking plague of forgetfulness'.⁵¹ He states that 'Falstaff's 'deeply flawed memory' is 'playing truant to his historical task'.⁵² But firstly, I disagree that Falstaff has a 'historical task', particularly one of nation building, which is what Baldo sees as the wider programme of the play. Falstaff can only be playing truant to it in the sense that he is providing an alternative and at places even opposing the 'historical task' the other characters in the play might perceive. And secondly, I disagree that Falstaff's memory is 'deeply flawed'. His memories may be multiple, but they are all equally valid as stories. Baldo admits that 'memory within the play [. . .] functions largely as an instrument of rebellion',⁵³ but sees that rebellious mode of memory as only belonging only to the rebels, not to Falstaff, who in offering alternatives to what happened allows us to think of alternatives too. At another point, Baldo contradicts himself when he admits that 'The power of Falstaff to recall so much [. . .] makes him the memorial equivalent of bombast or cotton padding for his original audience'.⁵⁴ I would agree that there is a surfeit of memory in Falstaff, but it does not follow that he is a person of 'mnemonic distraction',⁵⁵ as if he were throwing the audience off the scent by offering so many variations. On the contrary, I would argue that Falstaff's manifold memories reveal much about his engagement with time, and thus concentrate the audience's attention on the play's broader statement about 'the injuries [that] a wanton time' (5.1.50) can inflict on the characters in the play.

Conclusion

The court and the rebels alike in *1 Henry IV* are constantly searching for or relying on past memories which will justify the present time and bring about their desired future. Both Hal and Hotspur, in their own ways, look to the future, but:

The energy expended to control time creates an anxiety about what will be and from which [they] seek release [. . .]. [T]he tendency to relegate immediate things to the status of instruments only serving towards some ultimate, more

⁵¹ Jonathan Baldo, *Memory in Shakespeare's Histories: Stages of Forgetting in Early Modern England* (New York and London: Routledge, 2012), p. 52.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

perfect end, induces a kind of bewilderment and detracts from the significance of things.⁵⁶

Falstaff's relationship with memory and time is quite different: his memories are much more fluid and change even at the time of telling. They are not ossified and therefore they create neither a paralysed present nor a fossilized future. Falstaff side-steps the need to 'control time' and the resultant 'anxiety' that need creates; as a result, 'immediate things' are not relegated but used to live a life more vigorous than that of Hal or Hotspur. The characters' use of memories is indisputably interwoven with their understanding of time. The audience is enabled and even encouraged by Falstaff to question the conventional perception of time.

As Chapter 2 showed, there was no one sense of time in the Renaissance; equally, there is no one sense of time in the play. Memories can not only take a slow look at a particular moment (e.g. 1.3.29-69), but also a quick look at a long stretch of time (e.g. 1.3.166-185). The characters' memories expose how 'Time corrupts, infects, contaminates and disfigures, and future developments often bring the frustration of expectations.'⁵⁷ Characters' memories, whether retrospective or prospective, display their understanding of and connection with time, which in turn determines their actions and fate in the play world.

From Hal's perspective, Falstaff's dismissal in *Part Two*, planned from the very beginning of *Part One*, is a fulfilment of the 'perfectness of time' (2H4, 4.4.74). When Falstaff says 'I am old' (2H4, 2.4.268), it is as if he feels himself being yanked back into the chronological timeline of kings where he does not truly belong; Nigel Wood believes that 'a case could be made for Falstaff as the character most hounded by time's winged chariot.'⁵⁸ Perhaps Time knows that Falstaff has escaped him and his effects thus far in *Part One*. As his death in *Henry V* proves, 'The perpetually buoyant comic figure cannot wholly escape the condition of time to which the history of Prince Hal/ King Henry binds him.'⁵⁹ Yet Falstaff's own conception of the 'perfectness of time' is very different, as is evidenced by the completeness with which he occupies everything that precedes that dismissal; the fatness of Jack is a model of abundance, 'the true and perfect image of life indeed' (5.4.118). This is one example of the

⁵⁶ Quinones, 'Time and Historical Values in the Literature of the Renaissance', p. 53.

⁵⁷ Pugliatti, *Shakespeare the Historian*, p. 103.

⁵⁸ Wood, *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2*, p. 26.

⁵⁹ Grene, *Shakespeare's Serial History Plays*, p. 215.

struggle between the two characters and their two types of time; it allows the audience to imagine a future where 'plump Jack' (2.4.466) was left alive to challenge and contradict the time and memories of Henry V as the Epilogue to *Part 2* promised.

CHAPTER SIX:
MEMORY AND DEATH IN 2 HENRY IV

As in *1 Henry IV*, we find that *2 Henry IV* ‘embeds itself in a deep layer of time’,¹ but in this play time’s preoccupation is with the frailty of flesh, most obviously because the King is ailing, and faces the end of his reign with the prospect of his wayward son coming to the throne:

The blood weeps from my heart when I do shape,
In forms imaginary, th’unguided days
And rotten times that you shall look upon,
When I am sleeping with my ancestors.
(4.2.58-61)

Simon Callow remarks that ‘The king [. . .] is [time’s] slave, perpetually aware of its sands running ever more rapidly away’;² the play reeks of mortality, its characters increasingly aware that ‘the brevity of human life stands out against the immensity of indefinite chronological time.’³ In the play, the remembrance of the dead relies ‘on the memory of close relations who are in a position to [. . .] suffer the loss.’⁴ And again as with time in *1 Henry IV*, we find *2 Henry IV*’s preoccupation mirrored in the language of the play: there are 23 references to ‘dead’, 23 to ‘death’, 14 to ‘die’ and 3 to ‘died’, totalling 64; for the same four words the total in *Richard II* is 63; *1 Henry IV* has 41; and *Henry V* has 39.⁵

2 Henry IV opens with Rumour spreading ‘false reports’ (Induction, 8), among them the idea that:

Harry Monmouth fell
Under the wrath of noble Hotspur’s sword,

¹ William Shakespeare, *King Henry IV Part 2*, ed. A. R. Humphreys, Arden second series (London: Thomson Learning, 2003), p. lii.

² Simon Callow, *Actors on Shakespeare: Henry IV Part 1* (London: Faber and Faber, 2003), p. 73.

³ Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004), p. 155.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 587, n. 71.

⁵ For this and subsequent statistics regarding frequency of usage in the plays, I have used the concordance available at <http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/concordance/> [Last accessed 30.07.2013].

And the King before the Douglas' rage
Stoop'd his anointed head as low as death.

(Induction, 29-32; compare 1.1.14-7.)

The play's obsession with death is advertised from its outset, and Rumour admits its own twisted and deceitful propagation of memories: 'Rumour is a pipe | Blown by surmises, jealousies, conjectures' (Induction, 15-6). Like a round of Chinese Whispers, Rumour works by distorting the memories of events just past, leading to seemingly innocent 'surmises' and 'conjectures', but also encompassing more malicious 'jealousies'.⁶ Rumour operates to ensure that mutually exclusive possibilities – the king's failure (quoted above) and the king's success (Induction, 23-7) – are both circulated, even if history comes down decisively on the side of the latter. In this way Rumour joins with the 'cozening hope' of *Richard II* (2.2.69-72; also *R2*, 2.3.15-6) in promising to Northumberland and Lord Bardolph somewhat more than it can deliver (1.1).

Rumour demonstrates perfectly that there are rival perceptions of the dead, and that memories cannot necessarily be made to perform the work one wants them to. It is the first example of numerous contrasting memories of the dead in the play, the cumulative effect of which is to show memories as up for discussion and debate at any point. This chapter illustrates the larger argument of my thesis by showing how the characters' memories of the dead and their relationships with their dead in the play enable the audience continually to question the truth or otherwise of the historical memories presented before them. More specifically, I will use this chapter to look at three contrasting attitudes in the play to the remembrance of the dead.

The first approach is epitomised by the rebels in the first scene of the play. Northumberland hears of Hotspur's death at Shrewsbury and mourns his dead son, but the thoughts of those gathered around him quickly turn even further back to Richard, whose blood was 'scrap'd from Pomfret stones' (1.1.204-5). This memory of the dead king calls the rebels back to arms and insurgence. It is not only that Richard was usurped, but the explicit fact that his killing was premeditated, that spurred them to action in the first instance; and it is their undimmed memory of it, a sense of responsibility to the dead, and a campaign for what they see as justice in 'a bleeding land, | Gasping for life' (1.1.207-8) that endows them with a renewed sense of

⁶ Or, as the Folio's punctuation puts it, the surmises are themselves 'Jealousy's conjectures'.

purpose. Their idea of the role of memories in the commemoration of the dead is one which preserves ancient wrongs and ‘remembers past injustices’⁷ until they can be rectified. Later on in the play, in 2.3, Northumberland’s renewed focus on the death of his son obscures his remembrance of Richard and his resolution to take further action to right that wrong.

In contrast to this the play offers us the nostalgia of Justice Shallow, which is the second type of attitude to remembering the dead. Shallow mingles banal philosophising about dead acquaintances with observations about the thriving Stamford fair, where bullocks and ewes might be bought and sold, and sees no incongruity in this association (3.2.28-53). His speech puts memories of the dead on an equal footing with the concerns of the living in a comic way, which refuses to privilege the departed over those left behind. Shallow’s idiosyncratic manner of speech once again shows Shakespeare using language to create and complicate memories.

As the play draws to a close we are offered a third speech on the role of memories in preserving the dead. It is spoken to Hal by the king himself as he lies dying (4.5.181-219). The king relies on memories to do contradictory things. His speech reveals that he wants not only to conserve the memory of the dead King Henry IV in order to give his son and heir legitimacy in inheriting the crown ‘successively’ (4.5.201), but also to forget King Henry IV and his past misdemeanours ‘in action hence borne out’ which may placate the rebels, restore peace to the land, and ‘waste the memory of the former days’ (4.5.214-5). Henry fails to recognise the plurality of memories and their power to ignore the inconsistent imperatives he tries to impose on them.

Even by what might be considered just one function of memory – the commemoration of the dead – the characters of the play expect memories to perform many often conflicting tasks. Little wonder that the memories constructed of a dead person are always contestable. As Elizabeth Hallam and Jenny Hockey observe, ‘memory as process [. . .] involves complex negotiations such that what is recalled is always amenable to revision,’⁸ whether that is immediately after death as with Hotspur, some time after death as with Richard and ‘old Double’, and even at the point of death, as with Henry IV.

⁷ Duncan Bell, *Memory, Trauma and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 20.

⁸ Elizabeth Hallam and Jenny Hockey, *Death, Memory and Material Culture* (Oxford and New York: Berg, 2001), p. 23.

The Rebels: ‘a bleeding land, | Gasping for life’

In Act 1 Scene 1 the rebels meet before Northumberland’s castle to discuss the battle of Shrewsbury with which *Part 1* ended. Morton tells Northumberland the news that his son is dead (ll. 67-135), and understandably, Northumberland is devastated by it (ll. 136-160). However, the nobles who surround Northumberland suggest that he is focusing on the wrong thing. In mourning his son, Northumberland forgets that the true aim of the rebels is to remember and try to avenge the death of King Richard. A close reading of the exchange that closes the scene makes this clear. It begins with Lord Bardolph declaring:

We all that are engaged to this loss
Knew that we ventur’d on such dangerous seas
That if we wrought out life ’twas ten to one;
And yet we ventur’d for the gain propos’d,
Chok’d the respect of likely peril fear’d;
And since we are o’erset, venture again.
Come, we will all put forth, body and goods.
(1.1.180-6)

Bardolph acknowledges Northumberland’s ‘loss’, using a catalectic line to mimic that lack or absence, but argues that was to be expected, since the chance of winning and surviving was ‘ten to one’, fearful odds indeed. The three uses of ‘ventur’d’ (ll. 181, 183, and 185) compare the rebels’ mission to that of an Elizabethan merchant who sets his ‘body and goods’ upon the ‘dangerous seas’. This is a curious metaphor to use, since in either the merchant’s or the rebels’ case it implies little control over success or failure. Bardolph has no words of comfort, but a recommendation that – since they have been set back (o’erset’) by events at Shrewsbury and Hotspur’s death - they will simply ‘venture again’, risking life (‘body’) and livelihood (‘goods’) to pursue success. Once more they will choke back the fear of ‘likely peril’ and set sail on high seas where they may be shipwrecked and killed. Bardolph’s speech is honourable and courageous, filled with bravado but lacking in both sympathy for Northumberland and the promise of the rebels’ future success. Yet Morton’s response agrees with Bardolph’s general premise of setting forth once more, and supplies a reason for doing so:

'Tis more than time. And, my most noble lord,
 I hear for certain, and dare speak the truth,
 The gentle Archbishop of York is up
 With well-appointed pow'rs. He is a man
 Who with a double surety binds his followers.
 My lord your son had only but the corpse,
 But shadows and the shows of men, to fight;
 For that same word 'rebellion' did divide
 The action of their bodies from their souls;
 And they did fight with queasiness, constrain'd,
 As men drink potions; that their weapons only
 Seem'd on our side; but, for their spirits and souls
 This word 'rebellion'—it had froze them up,
 As fish are in a pond. But now the Bishop
 Turns insurrection to religion;
 Suppos'd sincere and holy in his thoughts,
 He's follow'd both with body and with mind;
 And doth enlarge his rising with the blood
 Of fair King Richard, scrap'd from Pomfret stones;
 Derives from heaven his quarrel and his cause;
 Tells them he doth bestride a bleeding land,
 Gasping for life under great Bolingbroke;
 And more and less do flock to follow him.
 (1.1.187-209)

Other than the first two lines, this long passage was cut from the Quarto and appeared only in the Folio. Its subject matter is the most obvious reason it caught the censor's eye – the 'double surety' with which the Archbishop recruits his army was the worst sort of insurgency imaginable in the Elizabethan era, as far as the powers that be were concerned, since it came from authority which was timely ('tis more than time'), political (the Archbishop is 'gentle', noble), and spiritual ('holy'). The abundance of indemnities with which the Archbishop 'binds his followers' is reflected in the unusually long line, which is 13 syllables. Morton takes up the 'body and goods' (l. 186) with which Bardolph finished his speech, and gives them specificity for Northumberland, whom both Bardolph and Morton are ostensibly addressing: 'My lord your son had only the corpse, | But shadows and the shows of men, to fight' (ll. 192-3). The 'corpse', the zombie-like body without soul or heart, is again mentioned when Morton talks of the 'rebellion' which 'did divide | The action of their bodies from their souls' (ll. 194-5); in contrast, Morton confirms towards the end of his speech that the Archbishop is followed 'with body and with mind' (l. 203). Morton's reason for the men's failure and death is that they were conflicted by the fact that their actions were

treasonable; the word 'rebellion' is used to signify this and is repeated at ll. 194 and 199, and modified to 'insurrection' at l. 201. Correspondingly, Morton feels the Archbishop will succeed, to use another's words, because 'his cause [is] just and his quarrel honourable' (H5, 4.1.127-8). He has 'enlarged' his army 'with the blood | Of fair King Richard, scrap'd from Pomfret stones' (ll. 204-5), making a holy relic of this dead man's blood, holding sacred his memory, deriving 'from heaven his quarrel and his cause' (l. 206). Morton implies that before the Archbishop made their 'cause' into a religious crusade, it was bound to fail, but now that it has God on their 'side' (l.198), it is certain to succeed. '[R]eligion' has got 'their spirits and their souls' (l. 198) and made their battle as 'sincere and holy' as the Archbishop's thoughts (l. 202).

The Archbishop also uses the memory of the dead King Richard to justify battle elsewhere in the play. 'What trust is in these times?' (1.3.100) he asks, lamenting the fact that the populace is too quick to forget, as a result of which 'They that, when Richard liv'd, would have him die | Are now become enamour'd on his grave' (1.3.101-2). Towards the end of the play, he uses the memory of Richard as part of his validation of the rebels' actions in conversation with Westmoreland: 'we are all diseas'd, | [. . .] of which disease | Our late King Richard being infected died' (4.1.54, 7-8). And once more he uses the idea of blood as an *aide-mémoire*: 'The dangers of the days but newly gone, | Whose memory is written on the earth | With yet appearing blood' (4.1.80-3).⁹ It appears that 'it [is] the flesh itself, or bodily substances such as bone, blood, and hair, that are regarded as powerful memory objects.'¹⁰ The Archbishop ensures that 'The past is never dead. It's not even past',¹¹ since it is held before rebels and court as a continually present justification for current action. Under his leadership, the renewed battle becomes 'the enduring mark of mourning.'¹²

Towards the end of his speech, Morton describes England as a dying man, 'a bleeding land | Gasping for life under great Bolingbroke' (ll. 207-8). Morton's statement confirms the fulfillment of Gaunt's prophecy in *Richard II* (2.1.31-60). Another way to look at this proclamation would be that the country is suffering from the same affliction as Richard did at death, 'bleeding' and 'Gasping for life'. Because of

⁹ The lines recall God's accusation of Cain: 'What hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground' (*The Geneva Bible, Facsimile 1560 Edition: The Bible of the Protestant Reformation* [Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007], Genesis 4:10).

¹⁰ Hallam and Hockey, *Death, Memory and Material Culture*, p. 134.

¹¹ William Faulkner, *Requiem for a Nun* (London: Random House, 2012), Act 1, Scene 3.

¹² Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, p. 366.

Bolingbroke's crimes, not only are the characters in the play dying, but the very land of England is as well. Morton is also careful to use Bolingbroke's name as it was before he was King Henry IV, in contrast to his use of King Richard's proper title and name just three lines previously. He concludes his speech by saying that 'more and less do flock to follow him' (l. 209), reminding us of the biblical masses of all ranks who flocked to follow Jesus. The word 'flock' is particularly associated with shepherding and the biblical connotations that term evokes. Thus in a final flourish the Archbishop is presented as a Christ-like figure of salvation who will raise Richard from the dead (metaphorically speaking) in order to demonstrate the credibility and justness of his cause and ensure its success, saving the rebels from death by allowing them to be reborn as righteous crusaders rather than seditious traitors.

Northumberland has stood and listened to the reasoning of both his fellow lords, and his final response to them as the scene closes is telling. He admits that:

I knew of this before, but, to speak truth,
This present grief had wip'd it from my mind.
Go in with me; and counsel every man
The aptest way for safety and revenge:
Get posts and letters, and make friends with speed:
Never so few, and never yet more need.

(1.1.210-5)

Northumberland, like Morton before him at l. 188, 'speak[s] truth', and admits that his grief for his dead son has made him forget the Archbishop's 'rising' (l. 204): 'I knew of this before, but, to speak truth, | This present grief had wip'd it from my mind.' Northumberland's remembering of one dead person has made him forget the actions of another, which are also inspired by a dead person. Considering that Hotspur was Northumberland's son, and that Richard's death lies further in the past, this is not surprising, yet Bardolph's and Morton's speeches have succeeded in restoring Northumberland's memory of the dead Richard and eclipsing the memory of the dead Hotspur. For the time being at least, Northumberland has refocused his mind on the task at hand, which is to seek 'revenge' for Richard's death (l. 212), and presumably, although it remains unstated, the deaths of Hotspur and the other rebels who have been killed in this long and bloody conflict. As Francis Bacon observed, 'Revenge

triumphs over death'.¹³ The Archbishop's reclamation of the rebels' campaign as a civil war with a persuasive religious warrant has created 'more need' for more men to bring the fight for the country to a conclusion.

'This present grief had wip'd it from my mind' is a poignant line, and expresses an emotion which will return to haunt Northumberland in 2.3. In a long speech of over 35 lines, his daughter-in-law Kate manages to persuade him to give up his campaign by causing him to remember Hotspur once more. Northumberland's response reveals the effect that this particular memory has had on him: 'Fair daughter, you do draw my spirits from me | With new lamenting ancient oversights' (2.3.46-7). This is as close as Northumberland gets to expressing regret at not being present at the battle where Hotspur met his death in *Part 1*, and his emotional response provokes a physical one which ironically repeats history, since Northumberland decides to forsake his plans to meet the other rebels at Gaultree. This abandonment of his confederates is at the expense of his 'honour' (l. 7), and at the cost of the memories of Richard and the other rebels. The rebels' aim is to secure 'safety' for themselves and divinely sanctioned revenge for Richard and their fallen allies. Their means of achieving and justifying this objective is to keep fresh their memories of the dead, which furnish a political imperative to act. Shoshana Felman writes of the 'haunting claim the dead have on the living, whose responsibility it is not only to remember but to protect the dead.'¹⁴ Yet Northumberland fails to privilege the 'responsibility' he has to 'remember' the dead Richard over his own 'safety' and the fresher memory of his dead son, which is why he fails to join the rebels at Gaultree. In dramatising Northumberland's actions, the play shows 'the ephemeral or fleeting nature of memories [. . .] acknowledged with the recognition that memories "fade" or threaten to wither or die and consequently need to be kept "alive".'¹⁵ Kate successfully manages to keep the memory of Hotspur 'alive' in Northumberland and 'fades out' his memory of Richard; this is quite the opposite effect to that which Bardolph and Morton achieved in 1.1. Memories of Richard lead to Gaultree, but memories of Hotspur lead Northumberland to retreat to Scotland. Memories of the dead complicate Northumberland's actions and confuse him: 'Fain would I go to meet the Archbishop, | But many thousand reasons hold me back'

¹³ Francis Bacon, *The Essays*, ed. and intro. John Pitcher (London: Penguin, 1985), 'Of Death', p. 56.

¹⁴ Shoshana Felman, *The Juridical Unconscious: Trials and Traumas in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2002), p. 15.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

(2.3.65-6). Memories drive his plot in directions he could not have foreseen and lead him to prevaricate: "Tis with my mind | As with the tide swell'd up unto his height, | That makes a still-stand, running neither way' (2.3.62-4). Finally he vanishes from the play and from the tetralogy, heading for Scotland, with only his memories for company.

Shallow: 'all shall die'

Act 3 Scene 2 opens with Justice Shallow speaking to his fellow Justice of the Peace, Silence, about his family – his daughter Ellen and his cousin William at Oxford. Because William is soon to go to the Inns of Court, Shallow is reminded of his own time there, and recalls his fellows, 'little John Doit of Staffordshire, and black George Barnes, and Francis Pickbone, and Will Squele, a Cotsole man [. . .] [and] Jack Falstaff, now Sir John' (3.2.17-24). But in thinking of Sir John, Shallow is distracted by more morbid thoughts:

SHALLOW	The same Sir John, the very same. I see him break Scoggin's head at the court gate, when a was a crack, not thus high; and the very same day did I fight with one Samson Stockfish a fruiterer, behind Gray's Inn. Jesu, Jesu, the mad days that I have spent! And to see how many of my old acquaintance are dead!
SILENCE	We shall all follow, cousin.
SHALLOW	Certain, 'tis certain, very sure, very sure. Death, as the Psalmist saith, is certain to all, all shall die. How a good yoke of bullocks at Stamford fair?
SILENCE	By my troth, I was not there.
SHALLOW	Death is certain. Is old Double of your town living yet?
SILENCE	Dead, sire.
SHALLOW	Jesu, Jesu, dead! A drew a good bow, and dead! A shot a fine shoot. John a Gaunt loved him well, and betted much money on his head. Dead! A would have clapped i'th'clout at twelve score, and carried you a forehand shaft a fourteen and fourteen and a half, that it would have done a man's heart good to see. How a score of ewes now?
SILENCE	Thereafter as they be; a score of good ewes may be worth ten pounds.
SHALLOW	And is old Double dead?
SILENCE	Here come two of Sir John Falstaff's men, as I think.

(3.2.28-53)

The Justices' thoughts

occupy the central space of the play and thus can – and should – be heard as central to Shakespeare's interests in this work. As the king's Justices of the Peace, these old men are not placebos of 'comic relief' but localized and reduced versions of loftier concerns.¹⁶

Silence's memory of the day he fought behind Gray's Inn is full of detail, to the extent that we can imagine the scene; indeed, Giorgio Melchiori argues that 'the life of the city is evoked more vividly in Justice Shallow's nostalgic reminiscences than in direct on-stage presentation',¹⁷ while A. R. Humphreys writes that these 'imaginative retrospective touches [. . .] extend the living reality of the characters' (3.2.24-5n.). These rural scenes may not be as sensuous as the other comic prose scenes they complement, those in Eastcheap, but still 'the scene is drenched in memory'.¹⁸ Considering how vividly Shallow's lines evoke life - 'Jesu, Jesu, the mad days that I have spent!' – it is interesting that they lead to a contemplation of death – 'And to see how many of my old acquaintance are dead!' The two are related because thinking about the past leads to the conclusion that time passes quickly and that all things will one day be past; Silence confirms that 'We shall all follow, cousin'.

Shallow's answer that 'Certain, 'tis certain, very sure, very sure' demonstrates his tic of repeating himself. The examples are too numerous to catalogue here, but Shallow's repetitions include 'come on, come on, come on: give me your hand, sir, give me your hand, sir' (3.2.1-2); 'Where's the roll? where's the roll? where's the roll? Let me see, let me see, let me see. So, so, so, so, so, so, so, so' (3.2.96-8); and 'Barren, barren, barren; beggars all, beggars all [. . .] Spread, Davy, spread, Davy, well said, Davy' (5.3.7-9). Nicholas Grene remarks that 'Shallow's comic old man's trick of repeating himself makes for an insistence on mortality even before Falstaff's arrival, as he ruminates on the latest deaths among Silence's neighbours.'¹⁹ The inordinate hilarity of the character may well hide the fact that the presentation of his speech through language such as this actively points attention to his engagement with memory, since Shallow's

¹⁶ Naomi Conn Liebler, "'And is Old Double Dead?': Nation and Nostalgia in *Henry IV Part 2*", *Shakespeare Survey 63: Shakespeare's English Histories and their Afterlives* (2010), 78-88 (p. 81).

¹⁷ William Shakespeare, *The Second Part of King Henry IV*, ed. Giorgio Melchiori (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), Introduction, p. 21.

¹⁸ L. C. Knights, 'Time's subjects: 2 *Henry IV*', in *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2*, ed. G. K. Hunter, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1970), p. 179.

¹⁹ Nicholas Grene, *Shakespeare's Serial History Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 212-3.

repetitions show in miniature the unravelling of memory, as if he has lost the memory of what he has just said, or of what he was about to say. It may be that Shallow tries to control his memories through this repetition, as if reinforcing them helps them to live again, but language is (at least in his case) unable to hold those memories in, or back. What Shallow demonstrates by his repetition as he gets stuck on a thought is the *stickiness* of memories when they take the form of nostalgia. There is no doubt that Shallow's memories are nostalgic and melancholy, longing, yearning, for days gone by. Shallow's repetitive language seems to be contagious too: in many places Falstaff picks up on Shallow's verbal spasm and echoes it back to him. Consider 'well said, Master Shallow; deep, Master Shallow' (3.2.159-160); 'No more of that, good Master Shallow, no more of that' (3.2.191-2) and 'I come, Master Shallow, I come, Master Shallow' (5.1.84). Yet there is an innocence about this nostalgia. Michael Kammen observes that 'Nostalgia, with its wistful memories, is essentially history without guilt',²⁰ and as such is a type of remembering which is beyond the reach of rebels or court: Shallow's memories of the dead have the luxury of being nostalgic precisely because he remembers those who died natural deaths, not those who were murdered or died in bloody battle. Yet, accordingly to Naomi Conn Liebler, nostalgia is Rumour's twin, since both are:

equally unstable and forceful as a shaper of perceived truths and thus equally capable of moving action [...] [B]ecause Nostalgia usually speaks through old men (Shallow, Silence and sometimes Falstaff here, John of Gaunt in *Richard II*), it tends to lack credibility with other characters on stage. But its voice does register on that stage, and on the audience, regardless. [...] Like Rumour's voice, once heard [...] it cannot be unheard.²¹

While Shallow reminisces about days gone by, and thinks on death to come, he interjects observations about the present. Immediately after remarking that 'Death, as the Psalmist saith, is certain to all, all shall die', he asks Silence the price of 'a good yoke of bullocks at Stamford fair'. In one breath he has masterfully, and quite unintentionally, put the humdrum economic concerns of country life on a par with a biblical observation about the universal nature of death. Shallow has once more inadvertently broached the topic of the relation of the living to the dead. He fails to be

²⁰ Michael Kammen, *Mystic Cords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1991), p. 688.

²¹ Liebler, "'And is Old Double Dead?'" , p. 84.

so blinded by his memories of dead 'old acquaintance' that it detracts from his relationship with the living, or defines or decides his activities in the present. This is in direct contrast to the undertakings of the rebels and the court, whose memories of dead comrades so often determine their present course of action.

Silence's response to Shallow's question is, 'By my troth, I was not there', but he might as well not have answered him at all, since Shallow is again distracted by the thought that 'Death is certain.' When he finds that 'old Double' is 'dead', it leads him to another memory of one of his 'old acquaintance':

Jesu, Jesu, dead! A drew a good bow, and dead! A shot a fine shoot. John a Gaunt loved him well, and betted much money on his head. Dead! A would have clapped i'th'clout at twelve score, and carried you a forehand shaft a fourteen and fourteen and a half, that it would have done a man's heart good to see.

(3.2.46-50)

After Agincourt, Henry V lists the lords and nobles who died, but remarks that 'of all other men' 'None else of name' had perished (4.8.106). He is a case in point of Jacques Rancière's observation that 'death in history is not directly the indiscriminate death of anonymous people. It is, primarily, the death of those who bear a name; death that is an event.'²² This is something that the rebels, in their discussions in 1.1, also bear out. But Shallow remembers the death of the 'little' people, who appear nowhere else in the tetralogy; 'Old Double' is the most prominent example of this. That his name is 'Double' is significant: recalling him allows memories to be duplicated as one leads to another. Liebler argues that 'The name recurs in the dialogue as if remembrance could bring him back, as if the fact of a man's death could be altered by invoking his name.'²³ Yet as I mentioned in Chapter 4, we know from Falstaff's treatment in *Henry V* that even the name is not crucial – the memory alone is enough to resurrect the dead, in a figurative sense.

Shallow does not privilege Gaunt over Double; his memories work to democratise the play's preoccupation with death, and return attention to those who are not peers, 'For the king dies just like everyone else'²⁴ or, as Shallow has it, 'all, all

²² Jacques Rancière, *The Names of History: On the Poetics of Knowledge*, trans. Hassan Melechy (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 'The Dead King', pp. 10-23.

²³ Liebler, "'And is Old Double Dead?'" , p. 79.

²⁴ Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, p. 368.

shall die.' It is a platitude that death is a great equaliser, but Shallow's memories ensure that it is actively shown to be so, as Liebler confirms:

John of Gaunt is not remembered here as King Henry's father or as the fourth of Edward III's seven sons, but as a courtier who liked to bet on archery contests; Thomas Mowbray's fame is not his implication in Wat Tyler's rebellion or in the murder of Woodstock (*Richard II*, 1.1.95-103), but as Falstaff's early employer. A levelling occurs here[.]²⁵

The conclusion of Shallow's story of 'old Double' is that 'it would have done a man's heart good to see' it. That the sight is no longer possible adds sadness to the nostalgia of Shallow's tale, but once again Shallow's reflection on death does not prevent him from focusing on the fullness of life; although the joy he remembers at witnessing old Double's shot is now past, he relives some of that pleasure vicariously through the memory. '[C]arried you a forehand' includes the ethical dative of 'you' which emphasises 'carried', securing the men's personal involvement with the story Shallow tells (or, at least, Shallow's perception of that involvement, since it remains uncertain how 'involved' Silence is in the tale).

But since hitting the bull's eye from that distance 'appears to be an almost impossible feat, [. . .] its intention may be to introduce Shallow as a nostalgic fantasist.'²⁶ If we believe Falstaff, Shallow is telling incorrigible fibs: 'every third word a lie' (3.2.301). Yet Shallow himself appears unaware of the deceptions which Falstaff accuses him of. It may be that Shallow has forgotten his own exaggerations; Shallow's distinctive digressive style could mask the fact that he is losing his grip on the events of his life, except that his utter commitment to the present moment in his talk of bullocks and ewes is, however incongruous, firmly allied to the contemporary reality. In either case, later in the scene Falstaff clearly disputes Shallow's memories of their youth and their dead acquaintances (3.2.295-327). But to what end? The key to that, I think, lies once more in Shallow's repetitious language, to which I now return.

When the actor playing Shallow repeats himself after a short interval, he is giving early cues to the other actors on the stage. Accepting that Elizabethan players

²⁵ Liebler, "'And is Old Double Dead?'" , p. 79.

²⁶ William Shakespeare, *Henry IV Part Two*, ed. René Weis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 3.2.44-5n.

had one to three words (and usually only one) given them on their roll as their cue,²⁷ when the Falstaff-actor is waiting for the Shallow-actor to finish speaking to begin his turn, an early cue would result in the Shallow-actor being spoken over before he has finished his part, with the result that Shallow blindly continues to speak even when Falstaff attempts to get a word in edgeways. Consider this example from 3.2.107-110. Here are the parts as written in a modern edition:

SHALLOW	Ha, ha, ha! Most excellent i'faith, things that are mouldy lack use: very singular good, in faith, well said, Sir John, very well said.
FALSTAFF	Prick him.

The Falstaff-actor's part looks like this (where [] indicates possible but unlikely cues, the length of the cue being between one and three words, and usually one):

-----[very] [well] said.
Prick him.

What the Falstaff-actor hears is this:

Ha, ha, ha! Most excellent i'faith, things that are mouldy lack use: very singular good, in faith, **well said**, Sir John, very **well said**.

What the audience hears is this (where { } show simultaneous speech):

Ha, ha, ha! Most excellent i'faith, things that are mouldy lack use: very singular good, in faith, **well said**, { Prick him. } (Prick him.)
Sir John, very **well said**.

So the Falstaff-actor interposes his line before his due time and the result is that Shallow carries on past what is necessary, and Falstaff appears impatient with Shallow. This happens throughout the scenes with Shallow: at least eight times, at 3.2.81 and 84 'good sir John'; 3.2.98 and 100 'Mouldy'; 3.2.159-60 'Master Shallow'; 3.2.177, 177, 179 'sir'; 3.2.191-2 'no more of that'; 3.2.213-4 'come'; 5.3.7-8 'Davy'; 5.3.30-1 'Be merry'. As a result it may appear to the audience that the actors have forgotten their lines, or are bungling their cues. It is easy to imagine that once this has happened once or twice in performance, or even as part of the rehearsal process, such as it was, the actors would have been careful to ensure that the other actor had finished speaking

²⁷ '[O]ne-word cues are quite normative.' See Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern, *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 88-90 (p. 89).

his part before beginning their own; but equally they might understand the amusement it is giving and continue to 'come in' deliberately as soon as they hear their cue.²⁸ Indeed, Tiffany Stern thinks that Shakespeare 'directs' the actors in his company through just such an intervention: 'the "premature" or "false" cue – the part that apparently gives the actor who is to speak his cue too early [. . .] bear all the hallmarks of deliberate scripting.'²⁹ By foregrounding the actors' own memories in this way, Shakespeare not only 'want[s] his actors to share in the surprise and tentativeness of the experiences he unfolds for his characters,'³⁰ but also reveals the necessity of and the difficulty of memories, particularly in transgressing them. As with Rumour, Shakespeare is exemplifying a remembering which is complexly deceptive even to the holder of the memory, something that, to return to my previous paragraph, Falstaff finds out about Shallow. For a playwright to do this is to demonstrate an acute awareness of his own art's inability to contain or express memories fully. Shakespeare wants us to realise what is happening to memory here: that it can be manipulated and abused but never absolutely contained or controlled by any one, particularly not when that person is emotionally involved in those memories, as they are when remembering the past – and the dead – as Shallow does. We must allow that Shallow is 'the effects rather than the cause of [his] language and our interpretation.'³¹

Greene remarks that 'Falstaff by his association with the prince acquired a life, but he also acquired an old age and death.'³² And Shallow and Falstaff are old, in their seventies at least if Silence's 'fifty-five year ago' (3.2.205) is to be believed. Norberto Bobbio remarks that 'The world of old people, all old people, is to a greater or lesser extent the world of memory. People say that ultimately you are what you have done, thought and loved.'³³ But 'Shallow plunges back into the past, a place to which Falstaff

²⁸ The play offers us another example of this in Mistress Quickly. Like Shallow, Quickly has the curious habit of repeating her words, echoing her sentiments. Some of the numerous examples include: 'I have borne, and borne, and borne, and have been fubbed off, and fubbed off, and fubbed off' (2.1.32-3); 'do your offices, do your offices, Master Fang and Master Snare, do me, do me, do me your offices' (II. 39-41); 'wilt though, wilt thou, thou bastardly rogue? Murder! Murder!' (II. 48-9).

²⁹ Tiffany Stern, *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 88.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

³¹ Harry Berger, Jr., *Making Trifles of Terrors: Redistributing Complicities in Shakespeare*, ed. Peter Erickson (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), p. 242.

³² Greene, *Shakespeare's Serial History Plays*, p. 213.

³³ Norberto Bobbio, *Old Age and Other Essays*, trans. and ed. Allan Cameron (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 12-13.

is by no means eager to follow.³⁴ Earlier in the play, Falstaff has begged Doll not to 'speak like a death's-head, do not bid me remember mine end' (2.4.231-2), and feared that 'thou't forget me when I am gone' (2.4.274), as indeed Fluellen does in *Henry V* (4.7.48-9). And it is true that the next play deals with Falstaff's death in the first few scenes, and then forgets about him as a character; but despite his rejection at the close of *2 Henry IV*, something, a trace of Falstaff, is left behind in *Henry V*. By being banished, and by dying, Falstaff becomes like King Richard before him, in that he is free to roam over the pages of the next play in others' memories and in ours. In a delightful irony, Falstaff arguably becomes more powerful after death than he was before; he lives on in the memory. Falstaff's loss hangs in the air after the play ends, 'outlasting the memory even of the glorious and necessary transformation of Hal into Henry V.'³⁵ The smug Prince John and Chief Justice feel that they have concluded everything nicely, but nothing could be further from the truth, as the Epilogue of this play, and the next play, show us. Falstaff's 'survival' in *Henry V*, such as it is, confirms that memories of the dead perform a seemingly miraculous task – they breathe life back into something that should be 'as cold as any stone' (*H5*, 2.3.25).

The variety of styles employed in the play, exemplified by these 'comic prose' characters, and those in Eastcheap, demonstrates the 'paces, pressures, and qualities' that make up the disparate nation of King Henry IV.³⁶ The energy and vitality of Shallow's and Falstaff's prose exist side-by-side with the poetry of the court and rebels' scenes. E. M. W. Tillyard, rather understating the matter, argues that this variety 'contrasts, and I believe was meant deliberately to contrast, with the comparative monotony of *Richard II*.'³⁷ Ludwig Borinski writes that Shakespeare's 'sense of awkwardness in the total freedom of prose made him escape into artificiality',³⁸ but these Gloucestershire scenes are not as artificial as they may appear; Shallow has an important link to ordinary life and the reality of the day-to-day, however much his nostalgia leads him backwards. For Shallow, 'death is not a negation of life seen as the great body of all the people but part of life as a whole – its indispensable component,

³⁴ Simon Callow, *Actors on Shakespeare: Henry IV Part II* (London: Faber and Faber, 2003), p. 48.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

³⁶ Humphreys, *2 Henry IV*, p. lxii.

³⁷ E. M. W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Penguin, 1991), pp. 295-6.

³⁸ Ludwig Borinski, 'Shakespeare's Comic Prose', *Shakespeare Survey 20: Shakespearian and Other Tragedies* (2002), 57-73 (p. 60).

the condition of its constant renewal and rejuvenation.³⁹ Through him, Shakespeare has remembered the lower classes of the dead, and acknowledged death's levelling effect. Shakespeare has given a particular form of memory, nostalgia, room to remember the dead in a minor key, but one much softer than the 'revenge' sought by the rebels. He has shown how the demands of the living can sit alongside the memories of the dead without acrimony. And through Shallow's repetitious language, he has reflected on the way memory can equivocate, and lead astray the person remembering. Shallow reveals memories that can be disingenuous and unreliable.

Henry IV: 'waste the memories of the former days'

I turn now to the final lengthy reflection on the involvement of memories with death in the play, which is the king's advice to Hal at 4.5.181-219. The scene begins with Hal soliloquising on his father as he sleeps, and slowly coming to the realisation that, as he sees it, his father has died (ll. 30-6). This is important if we allow that sleep is an emblematic death-in-miniature:

in sleep, we resemble ourselves in death, and if we could watch ourselves when we sleep we would perceive an image of ourselves in death – although one prior to the putrefaction and dissolution of our bodies. [. . .] Such an image of man in death precedes the image of oneself after resurrection. The image of man-in-death therefore implies, on the one hand, decay and corruptibility and, on the other, rebirth and incorruptibility.⁴⁰

'The image of [one] in death' is precisely what Hal 'perceives', so he grasps the crown and exits swiftly. But the king wakes and berates his son for his action in taking the crown while the old king still lives. Hal's accession to the throne has been forestalled by the seemingly miraculous 'resurrection' of his father. Once again, as with events at Shrewsbury in *1 Henry IV*, the play has deliberately tripped Hal up just as he is on the cusp of becoming Henry V. Indeed, Henry IV's reluctance to relinquish the crown is partly due to the untimeliness of Hal's eagerness to wear it. Hal falls into Hotspur's trap of chasing down his future before it is ready: 'thou wilt needs invest thee with my honours | Before thy hour be ripe? O foolish youth!' (ll. 95-6); 'Thou hast stol'n that

³⁹ Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. H. Iswolski (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), p. 50.

⁴⁰ William Engel, *Mapping Mortality: The Persistence of Memory and Melancholy in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, MA.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995), p. 216.

which after some few hours | Were thine without offence' (ll. 101-2); 'To stab at half an hour of my life. | What, canst thou not forbear me half an hour?' (ll. 108-9); 'For now a time is come to mock at form' (l. 118). However, Hal does manage to remedy the situation and regain his father's trust and subsequent blessing in the speech I will now analyse:

Come hither, Harry, sit thou by my bed.
And hear, I think, the very latest counsel
That ever I shall breathe. God knows, my son,
By what by-paths and indirect crook'd ways
I met this crown, and I myself know well
How troublesome it sat upon my head.
To thee it shall descend with better quiet,
Better opinion, better confirmation,
For all the soil of the achievement goes
With me into the earth. It seem'd in me
But as an honour snatch'd with boist'rous hand,
And I had many living to upbraid
My gain of it by their assistances,
Which daily grew to quarrel and to bloodshed,
Wounding supposed peace. All these bold fears
Thou seest with peril I have answered;
For all my reign hath been but as a scene
Acting the argument. And now my death
Changes the mood, for what in me was purchas'd
Falls upon thee in a more fairer sort;
So thou the garland wear'st successively.
Yet although thou stand'st more sure than I could do,
Thou art not firm enough, since griefs are green;
And all my friends, which thou must make thy friends,
Have but their stings and teeth newly ta'en out;
By whose fell working I was first advanc'd,
And by whose power I well might lodge a fear
To be again displac'd; which to avoid,
I cut them off, and had a purpose now
To lead out many to the Holy Land,
Lest rest and lying might make them look
Too near unto my state. Therefore, my Harry,
Be it thy course to busy giddy minds
With foreign quarrels, that action hence borne out
May waste the memory of the former days.
More would I, but my lungs are wasted so
That strength of speech is utterly denied me.
How I came by the crown, O God forgive,
And grant it may with thee in true peace live!

(4.5.181-219)

The king begins by addressing Hal by his diminutive name, 'Harry', as opposed to a more forthright 'Henry':

Come hither, Harry, sit thou by my bed.
And hear, I think, the very latest counsel
That ever I shall breathe.

He repeats the use of the name 'Harry' towards the end of his speech at l. 212. His familiarity with his son signifies a new-found ease and warmth in their relationship, which is also evidenced by his use of 'thou' and 'thee' to address Hal throughout the speech. Henry immediately announces that his thoughts are turning towards death, since this is 'the very latest counsel | That ever I shall breathe' (ll. 182-3). Line 182 is extrametrical, and metrical irregularity recurs throughout the speech, betraying the king's failing health. Indeed, of these 38 lines, 12 - almost a third - are irregular; of these twelve, ten are extrametrical and two are catalectic. These extrametrical lines no doubt contribute to the fact that, as he reaches the end of his speech, the King's 'lungs are wasted so | That strength of speech is utterly denied [him]' (ll. 216-7). The speech thus shows what it might cost a sick and dying man to speak at length and with such urgency.

Henry continues:

God knows, my son,
By what by-paths and indirect crook'd ways
I met this crown, and I myself know well
How troublesome it sat upon my head.

'[M]et this crown' is the first of many implications in this speech that Henry chanced upon his kingship – seeing as this is what 'God knows', it may be fortunate that, as Falstaff would have it, 'Rebellion lay in his way, and he found it' (*1H4*, 5.1.26). Yet the 'by-paths and indirect crook'd ways' by which he met it, combined with the emphasized reflective pronoun 'I myself' also makes it plain that Henry feels some personal culpability for his transgression.

The next passage in the speech shows how Henry hopes memory will help give his son the legitimacy his own reign was denied, since:

To thee it shall descend with better quiet,

Better opinion, better confirmation,
For all the soil of the achievement goes
With me into the earth.

The crown which sat so 'troublesome' on Henry's head in the previous passage will here descend to Hal (using a beautiful example of *omne trium perfectum*) with 'better quiet, | Better opinion, better confirmation.' Henry relies on the fact that the crown will 'descend' to Hal, as opposed to being 'met': Hal's authority is thus acquired by his being the first-born son of the previous king, and inheriting the crown through patrilineal right from a father 'of famous memory' (*H5*, 4.7.91).

Henry laments that the crown:

seem'd in me
But as an honour snatch'd with boist'rous hand,
And I had many living to upbraid
My gain of it by their assistances,
Which daily grew to quarrel and to bloodshed,
Wounding supposed peace.

'[B]oist'rous carries us back to the opening speech of *Richard 2* in which Richard mentions Henry IV's "boist'rous late appeal"⁴¹ (*Richard II*, 1.1.4).⁴² Henry's complaint that he 'had many living to upbraid' his capture of the crown is an unfortunate use of words, since the past tense of 'had' reminds us that many of those who 'upbraided' Henry are now dead, 'traitors' executed for 'Treason' (4.2.122-3). Henry remembers their chastisement of him, 'Which daily grew to quarrel and to bloodshed' (l. 194).

The next passage reveals the metatheatricality of Henry's role as king:

All these bold fears
Thou seest with peril I have answered;
For all my reign hath been but as a scene
Acting the argument.

Ironically, as Melchiori notes,⁴³ this metaphor is also used, although in different terms, by the King's enemy, Northumberland: 'let this world no longer be a stage | To feed contention in a ling'ring act'; 'the rude scene may end' (1.1.155-6; 159). But that may simply be because it is a universal feeling which runs throughout the play; Rumour too,

⁴¹ Berger Jr., *Making Trifles of Terrors*, p. 186.

⁴² The word 'boisterous' is found only fifteen times in the canon, and four of those instances are in the second tetralogy.

⁴³ Melchiori, *The Second Part of King Henry IV*, 1.1.151-9n., p. 67.

for instance, announces his existence in these terms, unfolding in the opening lines of the play 'The acts commenced on this ball of earth' (Induction, 5). Richard is described as an 'actor' too (for example, in 5.2.23-8), so metatheatricality is certainly not the exclusive property of this particular play. If these kings are only actors it is hardly surprising that they seem at times to have little control over the script. Henry faces death and hopes his subjects' memories will be kinder to his son, but recent history has not given him any precedent for this:

And now my death
Changes the mood, for what in me was purchas'd
Falls upon thee in a more fairer sort;
So thou the garland wear'st successively.

Once more Henry fixes on the idea that because Hal will wear the crown 'successively' it will 'fall upon' him in a 'fairer sort.' To repeat, Henry relies on the right of succession to give his son the unquestioned authority that he himself did not enjoy. 'Purchas'd' has the legal sense of 'acquired' – for the second time Henry equivocates about how he 'met' the crown – while 'fall upon thee' has the multiple senses: lineal descent; a crown descending from Heaven; as well as an unwanted imposition. However, to Henry's hope that his subjects' memories will support Hal a codicil is attached:

Yet although thou stand'st more sure than I could do,
Thou art not firm enough, since griefs are green;
And all my friends, which thou must make thy friends,
Have but their stings and teeth newly ta'en out;
By whose fell working I was first advanc'd,
And by whose power I well might lodge a fear
To be again displac'd; which to avoid,
I cut them off, and had a purpose now
To lead out many to the Holy Land,
Lest rest and lying might make them look
Too near unto my state.

At eleven lines this is the longest sentence of this speech by far, and comes with a dire warning – Hal must strive to distract his new subjects from their memories of his father's reign in order to stop them remembering that they once deposed a king and could well do so again. These friends of the king, whom Hal must make his friends, are described as tamed animals: 'their stings and teeth newly ta'en out'. But because their 'griefs are green' this gives little comfort or security. It was these friends' 'fell

workings' that 'advanc'd' Henry – there is the third insistence on his innocence – and since they had the 'power' then, they have it now to 'displace' Hal if they so choose. To avoid his own 'displacement', Henry says that he 'cut them off', which can mean simply 'take away' or 'reduce' but has obvious overtones of execution. As for the rest, he wanted to lead 'many' to the Crusades, but again uses equivocal language: in 'rest and lying' we hear not only the implication of holiday, but also of boredom, laziness and fibbing. In any case, to whose 'rest and lying' does the king refer? Ostensibly he means his subjects', but the syntax allows the phrase to mean his own, too. So the only course of action is a move abroad:

Therefore, my Harry,
Be it thy course to busy giddy minds
With foreign quarrels, that action hence borne out
May waste the memory of the former days.

Henry describes 'giddy minds'. It may be that he is referring to his courtiers, but the phrase could also be less specific, encompassing a broader view of his subjects or nation. '[G]iddy' can be interpreted as silly (the sense used in *H5*, 1.3.145), or as foolish and stupid (as at 1.3.89 in this play), or even as confused,⁴⁴ but in no sense is the term complimentary. Henry thinks these 'minds' can be distracted by foreign wars: 'action hence borne out | May waste the memory of the former days.' Bolingbroke hopes that glorious conquest abroad will erase people's memories of the dark side of his reign and the murderous way he 'came by the crown'. But this play has also shown the opposite, that action breeds memory, since the action at the battle of Shrewsbury provides the rebels' memories in Act 1 Scene 1. In the next play in the tetralogy, even as King Henry V sets forth for France, he finds himself faced with the traitors Cambridge, Scroop and Grey, who are living proof that 'action hence borne out' has not wasted 'the memory of the former days' of Richard II and Bolingbroke's deposition. In this section of his speech, Henry IV anticipates that memories, or rather the lack of them, will give his son a more unopposed rule after his death, but events both prior and subsequent to Henry V's coronation lead the audience to question the wisdom of this expectation. Finally Henry reaches the dénouement of his speech:

⁴⁴ David Crystal and Ben Crystal, *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary and Language Companion* (London: Penguin, 2004), 'giddy', p. 198.

More would I, but my lungs are wasted so
That strength of speech is utterly denied me.
How I came by the crown, O God forgive,
And grant it may with thee in true peace live!

His final rhyming couplet epitomises the contradiction of his whole speech by asking for things which are mutually exclusive. Forgiving how Henry 'came by the crown' (the final assertion in this passage that he did not actively seek it) is impossible while the usurper's son succeeds to the throne; living 'in true peace' is unmanageable if Hal has embroiled the nation in French wars in order to 'busy giddy minds | With foreign quarrels'.

Henry's speech is a confession of sorts, although, as I have pointed out, on four separate occasions he prevaricates about his culpability for Richard's deposition. It can also be considered as an oral will:

In the later sixteenth century and early seventeenth century, the last wishes of a dying person could be expressed through the spoken [. . .] word and these intentions were expected to be confirmed at the deathbed. [. . .] Will making was an act of memory performed by the dying as it involved certain recollections of the past and it was also a means by which the deceased was later remembered.⁴⁵

Obviously a king would have a written will, but the passage I have quoted from does include specific instructions to Hal and has the air of a man who is examining his life, seeking forgiveness from God for past sins. As with Shakespeare's portrayal of Northumberland's attempt to make Richard II read aloud the articles of his deposition, Shakespeare chooses not to portray Henry IV writing his will, but in the more intimate and personal act of oral revelation to Hal. By listening to his father's oral testament, Hal becomes 'the trustee and heir of that past history with all its blemishes and promises.'⁴⁶ But Hal also becomes the guardian of Henry's death, of how he will be remembered, and in doing so can influence his own kingship. Hal becomes custodian of his father's past: his wrongs, his achievements, his memories.

Henry's speech shows 'the reconciliation of father and son and the dying king's eager desire to see the crown lineally descended,' which 'demonstrates that in the end even Henry IV seems to endorse (albeit for pragmatic reasons) a hierarchically ordered

⁴⁵ Hallam and Hockey, *Death, Memory and Material Culture*, p. 160.

⁴⁶ Weis, *2 Henry IV*, p. 50.

view of the world.’⁴⁷ It is as if the king conveniently forgets that he took the crown from one king who was deemed unsuitable for it, only to give it to another whom only moments before he considered equally unqualified for kingship. Despite all Hal’s misdemeanours, whether perceived or otherwise, no one in the play, least of all the king, ever questions that the crown will succeed to him. From this perspective, little has changed in terms of the politics of the kingdom from one play to another, despite so much death, which this play is at pains to point out. The crown becomes a relic, akin to Richard’s blood in that it is a materialised object of memory: ‘Certain materialised objects had the capacity to represent social relationships, retaining them in memory, because they had come to be associated with the person, body and identity of their owners.’⁴⁸ No wonder Henry IV laments that ‘uneasy lies the head that wears a crown’ (3.1.31), since it was Richard’s before it was his; and no wonder Richard had such trouble relinquishing it to Bolingbroke (*Richard II*, 4.1.181-208).

Conclusion

2 *Henry IV* clearly demonstrates that ‘memory making constitutes a key aspect of cultural and social responses to death.’⁴⁹ But the play also grants the audience the realisation that commemorating the dead can be approached from different angles, and provides versions of events which are liable to revision. The play acknowledges and demonstrates the emotional power, political importance, religious significance and ethical imperative of reflecting on death and the dead, but by showing different responses and attitudes to them the audience is encouraged to recognise and interrogate the characters’ use of them for their own ends.

To the rebels and the court ‘it really matter[s] who occupies the throne’⁵⁰ despite – in fact, because of – the body count. Both the rebels and Henry IV share the aspiration for their memories of the dead to write a desired future. In the rebels’ case, this is the success of their cause and the overthrow of Henry IV, founded on the memory of the dead King Richard. In Henry IV’s case, it is the continued dominance over the rebellious elements of his court and the successful reign of his eldest son,

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁴⁸ Hallam and Hockey, *Death, Memory and Material Culture*, pp. 164-5.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁵⁰ Liebler, “‘And is Old Double Dead?’”, p. 88.

reliant on his own legacy. However, both parties fail to acknowledge that memories are manifold to the extent that they cannot be made slave to any one account of history. This is a realisation that Rumour unmistakably points out at the outset of the play.

But Shallow measures death differently and takes his friends' passing personally. Shallow places memories of the dead to on a par with the price of sheep. Through Shallow, Shakespeare shows a different kind of memory of the dead from that of either the rebels or Henry IV, and the different properties of that memory, which affects our impression of the role of memory in commemorating the dead in the play. Through Shallow, the labouring lower ranks are recollected and claim a central place at the play's heart. Memory as nostalgia permits the emotional impact of remembering the dead to exist without invoking a struggle for political power. But most importantly, Shallow's repetitive language takes on a rhythmic quality that betrays how memories can deceive the person remembering. This is something that both Hal and the audience will have confirmed in *Henry V*, as the next chapter will go on to show.

CHAPTER SEVEN:
MEMORY AND FORWARD RECOLLECTION IN *HENRY V*¹

In this final chapter on the plays of the second tetralogy I want to expand on the instances of prolepsis I have found in each of the other plays by focusing on forward recollection in *Henry V*. The Kierkegaardian concept of ‘repetition’, which I call forward recollection, furnishes this thesis with an innovative way of considering how prolepses work in the plays as memories of the future. It is vital to this thesis because it is essential to properly understand the characters in the plays and the effect of the plays on their audiences: it grants the characters possibilities, even if they are not grasped or realised, of being more than their historical roles seem to allow; and it allows the audience to envisage a future which is radically different from that imagined by the characters or the plays more widely.

It is helpful to restate briefly my understanding of Kierkegaard’s concept, which I elucidated in Chapter Two. Kierkegaard asserts that:

Repetition and recollection are the same movement, just in opposite directions, because what is recollected has already been and is thus repeated backwards, whereas genuine repetition is recollected forwards.²

Because ‘Repetition and recollection are the same movement’, it becomes difficult, if not disingenuous, to discuss one without the other. The ethical and political power of forward recollection is that it opens the past up to the future by revealing glimpses of the future in the past, yet on the understanding that neither the past nor the future are fixed, but both are subject to change.

In this chapter I want to concentrate on the two main opportunities the play gives the audience to create memories of the future: the Chorus’s speeches,³ and Henry’s address to his soldiers prior to the battle at Agincourt.

¹ An early version of parts of my chapter on *Henry V* appeared in “[R]emember, with advantages”: Creating Memory in Shakespeare’s *Henry V*, *The Journal of the Northern Renaissance*, 2 (2010), n. pag..

² Søren Kierkegaard, *Repetition and Philosophical Crumbs*, trans. M. G. Piety, intro. Edward F. Mooney (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 3.

With regard to forward recollection, the Chorus works in two main ways. Firstly, it repeatedly says that the audience is in control of how the play is perceived, which proves that the past is not frozen, but fertile ground for breeding fresh interpretations, both now and in the future. Future audiences will be as much in charge of how those memories are made as we are now: the Chorus insists that we all have an equal right to our own interpretation of his words and the speeches of the characters. The Chorus shows that an alternative is possible to some of the characters' experiences, who are locked into their roles as historical figures whose basic fates are preordained. The Chorus insists that, through their active engagement with the play, the meaning the audience ascribes to the past – their understanding of it, and the significance they attribute to it – is not petrified, but fluid and charged with optionality. And if the meaning they ascribe to the past is fluid, then so is that past, because the past is inseparable from their interpretation of it: if, as I argued in Chapter 2, history is the narratives we generate to make coherent sense of the past, then before and between the acts, the Chorus invites and empowers the audience to create – through memories – an alternative history or histories themselves. This aspect of the Chorus's function makes possible the second feature of his work, which is more directly related to forward recollection. Because the Chorus enables the audience to remember the past as they wish to, it unlocks the tantalizing prospect of imagining the future as they wish it as well. Throughout its speeches, the Chorus underscores how powerful our thoughts can be, particularly those that enlist our 'imaginary forces' (1.0.18).

The second instance of forward recollection I want to focus on occurs in Henry's speech at Agincourt (4.3.40-67). I will offer a close reading of this speech to demonstrate that Henry wants to forge memories of the future for his auditors, onstage and off. How successful he is at this is a matter for debate, and the play itself provides contrasting answers, proving that telling the audience what to make of the future is not always effective. With the benefit of hindsight, and as the Epilogue confirms, some of his predictions turn out to be decidedly unreliable.

³ I refer to the Chorus in the singular as a character or person (as opposed to disparate 'Choruses'), and in the masculine, although I am aware that the Chorus can be, and has been played by actors of both sexes, and also as a 'chorus' (with a small 'c') – a disembodied voice rather than a character.

The Chorus

I will now discuss the Chorus's involvement with forward recollection in three sections. The first section will reflect on how he lets the audience fashion their own memories of the events presented before them. The second section will highlight and discuss the factors that complicate this process. The third section will consider how the Chorus engages more directly with the orientation of forward recollection towards the future.

1: 'a muse of fire'

The Chorus is one of the main features that mark *Henry V* out from the other plays in the second tetralogy. He appears at the start of the play prior to the first act as Prologue, then reappears at the beginning of each subsequent act, and finally at the conclusion of the play to provide an Epilogue. On a simple level the Chorus serves to show the passage of time, glossing over in forty or fifty lines the period between the scene that precedes its appearance and the scene that succeeds it, standing in and for the pauses between the acts of the play. The Chorus adopts an ostensibly modest and humble manner, apologising for the company's inadequacies as he tells us what has happened between the acts. Yet it has often been noted that

one of the most peculiar features of [the Chorus's] appearance is how frequently and consistently he whips up enthusiasm for his *misrepresentation* of what follows. [. . .] In varying degrees the events of each act belie the claims made by the Chorus that introduces it.

The Chorus is a case in point of Walter Benjamin's observation of 'how much more significant and enduring the anticipation of an event can be than what actually ensues.'⁴ Sometimes, the Chorus says one thing and the play shows another. For example, the Chorus tells us that

The French, advised by good intelligence
Of this most dreadful preparation,
Shake in their fear, and with pale policy
Seek to divert the English purpose.
(2.0.12-5)

⁴ Walter Benjamin, 'A Berlin Chronicle', in *One-Way Street and Other Writings*, trans. Edmund Jephcott and Kingsley Shorter (London: Verso, 1979), pp. 293-346 (p. 333).

In fact, when we do finally see the French, quite the opposite is true, as they bravely, 'with men of courage', prepare to face the English (2.4.1-14). Douglas Bruster and Robert Weimann write of the 'astonishing incongruity between what the representing chorus says the play is about and what is actually represented in the text of the play.'⁵ In fact, not only does the Chorus misrepresent the action of the play, in places his representation of the facts is inconsistent. At one point it is the English who are implicitly powerful (as above); at other points, the English are 'low-rated', 'poor condemned', a 'war worn', 'ruined band' (4.0.19, 22, 26, 29). The Chorus is an unreliable narrator, which encourages the audience to question both the veracity of his claims and the reliability of the history presented before them. Graham Holderness writes that the Chorus 'seeks to cultivate in the spectator, by the use of "alienating" dramatic devices, an attitude of critical detachment and objective curiosity.'⁶ The function of the Chorus, as Holderness points out, is to focus our attention on 'the artifice of the drama's construction';⁷ 'The Choruses are there to foreground the artificiality of the dramatic event'.⁸ As in other plays in the tetralogy, this metadramatic aspect of *Henry V*, embodied in the Chorus, promotes in the audience a sceptical attitude to the version of history the play dramatizes. Although he laments the lack of one in the opening line of the play, the Chorus himself is 'a muse of fire' (1.0.1), who inspires the audience to burn through the strictures of authorised historical narratives and create memories of their own.

Holderness states that the Chorus's metadramatic dimension places 'a barrier between action and audience'⁹ and, as Marjorie Garber remarks, 'Because of the conventions of the theatre the audience cannot intervene, cannot speak out to tell the truth'.¹⁰ But that barrier is there to be broken down, and the audience is so placed as to perceive the truth even if it cannot speak it. For the Chorus is also an interface between the play and the spectators, courteously soliciting the audience's participation. In acting as an intermediary, the Chorus raises the question of the

⁵ Douglas Bruster and Robert Weimann, *Prologues to Shakespeare's Theatre: Performance and Liminality in Early Modern Theatre* (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 147.

⁶ Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare's History* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1985), p. 75.

⁷ Graham Holderness, Nick Potter and John Turner, *Shakespeare: The Play of History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988), p. 75.

⁸ Holderness, *Shakespeare's History*, p. 137.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

¹⁰ Marjorie Garber, "'What's Past Is Prologue': Temporality and Prophecy in Shakespeare's History Plays', in *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History and Interpretation*, ed. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1986), pp. 301-31 (p. 304).

location of the edge of theatre by stepping out of the play only to invite his auditors into it. We see the Chorus erasing this border between the play's original audience and himself most clearly when he allies himself with them by referring to what is happening beyond the play's illusionistic margins: Essex's campaign in Ireland (5.0.30-4). No other character in the play has this ability; no other Shakespeare play makes reference to such a contemporaneous event;¹¹ and the Chorus's breaking down of barriers is particularly evident within the early modern thrust stage space, as opposed to the later proscenium arch, because the Chorus can come amongst the audience to address them with an intimacy the enclosed space of the proscenium stage precludes. The Chorus is characterised, not only because he is usually played by a human being rather than by a discarnate voice, but also because of his shifting point of view. '[T]hat the Chorus varies his perspective according to the course of events gives the audience the impression of his active participation in the events.'¹² The Chorus betrays human emotions such as longing (1.0.1), embarrassment (1.0.8, 15), pride (2.0.16-19) and scorn (2.0.26). The Chorus is not just a dramatic mechanism in the play, but exists as a character in a different ontological space, a zone separate from the scenes presented. He can step outside these scenes, refer to events long after they have taken place, and yet draw us into them, too.

The Chorus asks the audience to do the work that Shakespeare's writing and the company's acting are unable to do: they are urged to 'Suppose' that they have really 'seen | The well-appointed King at Hampton pier', 'the hempen tackle ship-boys climbing', 'the threaden sails', 'the furrowed sea' (3.0.3-4, 8, 10, 12); to 'suppose', to 'divide', to 'think' all these things into being: the horses, the men, the castles (1.0.19, 24, 26). The imperatives the Chorus uses are reminiscent of the way Henry commands his followers, and thus the audience seems bound to the service of the Chorus in the same way that Henry's followers are bound to him. G. P. Jones goes so far as to state that 'the audience is bullied' by these injunctions.¹³ Yet this ignores the fact that the spectators are given the opportunity to devise their own memories of the play. The Chorus facilitates this by helping us see in our 'mind's eye', to use a Shakespearean

¹¹ Neil MacGregor, *Shakespeare's Restless World* (London: Allen Lane, 2012), p. 104.

¹² Tanja Weiss, *Shakespeare on the Screen: Kenneth Branagh's Adaptations of Henry V, Much Ado About Nothing and Hamlet* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000), p. 61.

¹³ G. P. Jones, "'Henry V': The Chorus and the Audience", *Shakespeare Survey 31: Shakespeare and the Classical World* (1979), 93-104 (p. 97).

coinage from *Hamlet* (1.1.115),¹⁴ what is being portrayed on stage. Tiffany Stern writes:

Often Shakespeare utilises the spectators so that they become, unwittingly, part-actors in the plays that they are observing. They can supply the massed army that the *Henry V* prologue could not come up with. When Henry ends his 'once more unto the breach, | Dear friends' speech with a three-part expression designed to elicit applause, he urges the audience to cry out and swell the multitude: 'cry God for Harry, England and Saint George!'¹⁵

But we are not necessarily 'unwitting' or involuntary collaborators in the plays that we are observing, because rather than passively reading and watching, we actively conjure up the images that the Chorus evokes. We collude in the play's creation: 'the chorus in *Henry V* insists [. . .] on our complicity with the play to the extent that we continue reading or watching at all.'¹⁶ Indeed, 'we are reminded of events that will soon take place just as we are asked to forget them – and this will not be by divine sanction but by an audience's *willing* suspension of disbelief.'¹⁷ Lawrence Danson agrees that 'The Chorus needs our sympathetic participation. [. . .] We must be willing.'¹⁸ As I observed when noting the Chorus's imperatives, it is quite possible that the Chorus is manipulating the audience's sympathies, but they still do as the Chorus asks, and therefore the great scenes presented to them by productions of the play make sense even when the dramatic action does not corroborate what the Chorus has just said. This has led Andrew Gurr to explain that 'the Chorus is responsible for Olivier's and Branagh's cinematic images of epic battles scenes that are not in the play.'¹⁹

If the audience knows the story of Henry V's campaign in France from another source, the Chorus's attempts to allow them to forge their own memories of those events become more obvious. The audience might well remember what they know of Henry's battles in France, and note where their recollection conflicts with what the Chorus tells them. This would induce the audience to recognise that there is no one version of these events. The Chorus does depart from his sources in places, for

¹⁴ William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. Harold Jenkins (London: Thomson Learning, 2000). All subsequent references are to this edition.

¹⁵ Tiffany Stern, *Making Shakespeare: From Stage To Page* (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 28.

¹⁶ Ewan Fernie, 'Action! *Henry V*', in *Presentist Shakespeares*, ed. Hugh Grady and Terence Hawkes (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), p. 106.

¹⁷ Nigel Wood, *Henry IV 1 and 2* (London: Open University Press, 1995), p. 13, my emphasis.

¹⁸ Lawrence Danson, 'Henry V: King, Chorus, and Critics', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 34:1 (Spring, 1983), 27-43 (p. 30).

¹⁹ *Henry V*, ed. Andrew Gurr, p. 9.

example, when he omits to mention the stakes in front of English lines used to kill the horses of the charging French (found in Shakespeare's main source, Holinshed). When the Chorus says, 'Vouchsafe to those that have not read the story, | That I may prompt them' (5.0.1-2), he also prompts those who *have* 'read the story' by giving an alternative version of events. The changes to this story which the audience may have seen portrayed in other *Henry* plays of the period highlights the arbitrariness of what is included in an historical account, and what is left out.

The Chorus makes obvious the theatricality of his role and the play, but simultaneously razes that potential barrier by various means; he employs imperatives but asks the audience to use their imaginations to create the memories he and the company cannot; and he manipulates the audience's sympathies but manages to secure their compliance with his requests. Clearly, the Chorus is a complicated character, but a skilled one, too. In the next section I wish to consider how successful the Chorus is at letting the audience create their own memories.

2: 'Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts'

In *Henry V*, Shakespeare manipulates our sense of the passage of time by manipulating his scenic divisions: 'The periods of time which are assumed to have elapsed between the scenes leading up to the battle of Agincourt are short, and hence time seems to drag slowly',²⁰ while elsewhere time flies by as the Chorus wafts us over oceans: 'Heave him away upon your winged thoughts | Athwart the sea' (5.0.8-9). If we allow that 'breaks' in the action can serve as spaces for memories to occupy (as explained in my chapter on *Richard II*), it is significant that it is the Chorus that bridges the gaps between the acts in this play. The Chorus thus acts as an agent of time: 'myself have play'd | The interim, by remembering you 'tis past' (5.0.43-4). It is possible to read 1 and 2 *Henry IV* as an extended Prologue to *Henry V*. Not the least problem with such a reading, however, is that it denies the *Henry IV* plays their status as discrete works of dramatic art. But if we do accept them as a kind of 'waiting room' for *Henry V* – as Hal for one seems to regard them – we could hear Hal saying with Hamlet that 'the interim is mine' (*Hamlet*, 5.2.73). Yet when the Chorus says that he himself has 'play'd | The

²⁰ John Wilders, *The Lost Garden: A View of Shakespeare's English and Roman History Plays* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1978), p. 11.

interim,' he inevitably shares or even appropriates some of Henry's power to effect the 'remembering' of what is past. The Chorus's language here reveals his engagement with time, which has a bearing on his effectiveness in allowing the audience to create their own memories in response to the plays.

As Danson observes, the Chorus 'has limited control over the reception of his own story.' This is the main point of the Chorus – that the imaginative power to create the performance lies as much with the audience as with the authors and actors. The point is apparent in 'the mode of address: if you argue and tell, someone may respond, and if you invoke authority (even narrative authority) someone is bound to counter it. The Chorus's awareness of his limitation is built into his role.'²¹ The Chorus says that in interpreting the play the audience must 'Piece out [his] imperfections with [their] thoughts' (1.0.23) by 'jumping o'er times' (1.0.29), and turn 'th'accomplishment of many years | Into an hour glass' (1.0.30-1) – with the codicil that in doing this, they 'Admit [him] Chorus to this history' (1.0.32). 'Turning th'accomplishment of many years | Into an hour glass' refers primarily to the fact that Henry's historical campaign of six years (1414-1420) is condensed into the two-hour's traffic of the stage, or one 'turn' of the hour glass.²² Yet

far from appearing here as a trite emblem of an abstraction 'Time', in the context of this Chorus the hour-glass is a packed and potent symbol of the way in which historical drama can simultaneously acknowledge the loss of the past, and yet by a simple trick of 'turning' formally re-enact and review its passage.²³

Thus one can also hear in the Chorus's phrase a caveat against the facile vulgarising or reduction of memories.

Although our power to act, to effect change in a play, is curtailed by the fact of our being spectators, and although as spectators we invest the Chorus and the actors with the power to act on our behalf, we retain the authority to imagine a play that has not been performed, and a history that has not occurred. For as long as we are present in the theatre we give a licence to the actors, because we allow them to act while we watch them. Normally this licence to act returns to us when the play ends, the characters evaporate, and the actors depart the stage, leaving us with our memories of the play and the capacity to act if we should so desire. But in *Henry V* we

²¹ Danson, 'Henry V: King, Chorus, and Critics', p. 39.

²² Craik, *Henry V*, p. 121.

²³ Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare: The Histories* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), p. 139.

possess that capacity *during* the play as we make our memories of the 'interim' times – the periods glossed over by the Chorus between the acts - even while the play is being performed; and the play cannot continue, does not make sense, without our interaction with it, which is one of the things that makes *Henry V* such an extraordinary play in terms of its creation and complication of memories.

The Chorus gives us the opportunity to weave our own unique, inimitable memories of the play. Unlike Henry, who strives to forge collective memories at Agincourt, the subjectivity of the Chorus accepts that the communal memories he allows will be various and splintered: 'The collective effort insistently demanded of the audience is confidential and personal in its strategy rather than collective and public.'²⁴ This means that the actions of the Chorus are more ethical than those of Henry. The difference is explained by Avishai Margalit who distinguishes between 'common memory', which combines the memories of individuals, and 'shared memory' which 'integrates and calibrates the different perspectives of those who remember the episode.'²⁵ For Margalit, 'common memory' implies that, although many individuals hold memories of what happened, they are unethically conflated culturally or politically into one subsuming version. However, if voluntarily pooled, 'shared memory' (as opposed to 'common memory') *can* be an ethical way to retain memories. We have witnessed characters in the rest of the tetralogy using memories to justify actions which are ethically dubious: denying identity or subjectivity, tying themselves to the demands of time and history, or privileging justice for the dead over the demands of the living. The Chorus's use of memories, however, gives us an example of ethical memories.

The Chorus's final appearance, the Epilogue, is a harsh end to the play, demolishing the audience's memories of 'this star of England' (Epilogue 6) and his success with a coda which confesses his heirs' failure (Epilogue 12). Once more England is left bleeding, as prophesied by Carlisle in *Richard II* (4.1.138), and as claimed by the Archbishop in *2 Henry IV* (4.1.80-3). The Epilogue emphasises the circularity of the tetralogy, pointing forward to Henry's death and his son's succession, and back to the first tetralogy 'which oft our stage hath shown' (Epilogue 13). Clifford Leech observes that 'the very fact that generation succeeds generation in these plays

²⁴ Jones, "'Henry V': The Chorus and the Audience', p. 97.

²⁵ Avishai Margalit, *The Ethics of Memory* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2004), p. 51.

suggests that the danger to which the first generation succumbed will be recurrently present.²⁶ Yet again we are forced to admit that little has changed over the course of the plays, at least for their characters; but that denies the subtle hints of the Chorus elsewhere in *Henry V* that show how proleptic memories can be made to help forge an alternative future:

Assuming our lives are just a cycle, going around and around seemingly without end, means we can switch off from being open to anything radical, the freshness of the present lost in the perceived inevitability of the future, a future already moulded by a past based on patterns, predictability and experience. It means we lose touch with the real possibilities available to us now in the present.²⁷

It is these proleptic memories I now wish to focus on in the third section of my discussion of the Chorus, which considers how he is engaged in forward recollection.

3: 'Play with your fancies'

Because the Chorus empowers the audience to remember the past as they please, he endows the enticing idea of imagining the future as they please, too. Although this is less obviously stated by the Chorus, it is glimpsed through lines such as 'Then brook abridgement and your eyes advance | After your thoughts straight back again to France' (5.0.45-6). The Chorus asks the audience to 'advance' their thoughts and eyes in order to go 'back'. '[B]rook' can mean the expected 'endure' or 'allow' but also 'enjoy', as in *Richard II* 3.2.2. The audience *enjoys* the 'abridgement' of the Chorus's story and moves forwards with their 'thoughts'.

The Chorus 'defiantly emphasizes the powers of the imagination as opposed to the artifices of the stage architect.'²⁸ His desire for 'a muse of fire, that would ascend | The brightest heaven of invention' (1.0.1-2), declares his intentions in the opening lines of the play for something beyond, above, what is presented. These prefatory remarks proclaim his yearning for 'invention' – that is to say, 'creative imagination' (*OED* 4). Moreover, it is the audience's imaginations which he wishes to influence: 'let us [. . .] | On your imaginary forces work' (1.0.17-8). His plea that we 'Piece out our

²⁶ Clifford Leech, 'Shakespeare and the Idea of the Future', *University of Toronto Quarterly* 35 (1966), 213-28 (p. 226).

²⁷ *The Economist Intelligent Life Magazine*, Jan/Feb 2012, p. 27.

²⁸ Jones, "'Henry V': The Chorus and the Audience", p. 102.

imperfections with your thoughts' (1.0.23) shows how reliant he is on the audience's willingness to supplement ('piece out') the shortcomings ('imperfections') of both the Chorus's speech and the scenes presented by other characters in the play.

The Chorus's references to imagination continue throughout his subsequent appearances. Before Act 2 commences, he asks England (and by extension the audience) to imagine, 'What mightst thou do, that honour would thee do, | Were all your children kind and natural!' (2.0.18-9). He implies that empathising with one's kin (being 'kind') and fulfilling the law of nature (being 'natural') would lead to the honourable actions the play subsequently portrays. Before Act 3, the Chorus once again informs the audience that 'with imagined wing our swift scene flies' (3.0.1), and asks them to 'Play with [their] fancies' (3.0.7). Before Act 4 the audience is asked to 'entertain conjecture of a time' (4.0.1), in a narrow sense of the night, but more widely of the story. Before Act 5, the Chorus mentions the audience's 'winged thoughts' (5.0.8) and asks us to 'imagine him upon Blackheath' (5.0.16). He asks us to 'behold' the scenes 'In the quick forge and working-house of thought' (5.0.22-3), which Craik glosses as 'in imagination, with its rapid and lively shaping power' (5.0.23.n.).

By allowing the audience to construct memories of these past events, the Chorus also releases the potentiality for their creativity and inventiveness to 'suppose', 'think', or even 'eke out' (1.0.19, 26, 3.0.35) something different for what is to come. If they can do this, and combine it with their imagination, a huge vista opens up to them: nothing less than an altered future. If the past is theirs for the making, why not the future also? Kierkegaard insists that 'imagination can produce everything.'²⁹ The Chorus offers 'a forward future-orientated move towards [. . .] open possibilities, not fixed finalities',³⁰ and these 'open possibilities' are not only enabled by imagination, but dependant on it. Joanne Alteri sums this up superbly:

if the play's reality depends from the first on an audience's ability to 'piece out our imperfections with your thoughts', then the same thoughts can 'carry them here and there, jumping over time' 'and well digest | The abuse of distance' because the only boundary is the imagination: 'Thus with imagin'd wing our swift scene flies, | In motion of no less celerity | Than that of thought'.³¹

²⁹ Kierkegaard, *Repetition*, p. 56.

³⁰ Edward F. Mooney, 'Repetition: Getting the World Back', in *The Cambridge Companion to Kierkegaard*, ed. Alastair Hannay and Gordon D. Marino (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 282-307 (p. 287).

³¹ Joanne Alteri, 'Romance in *Henry V*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 21:2 (Spring, 1989), 223-40 (p. 231).

Of course, the play, like the plays of the second tetralogy before it, is clear that Henry worries about a closed future. This is the doom Henry fears on the eve of battle because of remembered sins (4.1.289-302). In his argument with Williams, Court, and Bates (4.1.86-226) the alternative, potential futures which they visualise are brought into conflict with the future Henry envisages, and show what it might have felt like if history had gone another way. Although there are fewer instances of overt textual anticipation and forward recollection in the Chorus's speeches than in the speeches of some characters in this play or indeed in other plays of the second tetralogy, throughout *Henry V* the Chorus's very presence and state of mind, his admonitions, requests, pleas and inducements, exemplify how forward recollection works in the play:

Repetition means getting our cognitive and moral bearings not through prompted remembering, but quite unexpectedly as a gift from the unknown, as a revelation from the future. Repetition is epiphany that [. . .] grants something radically new.³²

The Chorus enables the audience to be 'the historian [who] is a prophet facing backward'; 'The seer's gaze is kindled by the rapidly receding past.'³³ The Chorus instructs the audience to 'Work, work your thoughts!' (3.0.25) in order to call to mind true things, and the real importance of the story, by their pale imitations: 'Yet sit and see, | Minding true things by what their mockeries be' (4.0.52-3).

Henry

The Chorus's language is intensely rhetorical and embellished with devices of all descriptions including syllepsis and antanaclasis, which makes it quite distinctive.³⁴ But it is also, at times, 'very close to Henry's own' language.³⁵ When Henry speaks of 'fathers [with] silver beards, | [. . .] naked infants | [and] mad mothers' (3.3.36-9), we

³² Kierkegaard, *Repetition*, p. viii.

³³ Walter Benjamin, 'On the Concept of History', in *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 4, 1938-1940*, ed. Marcus Paul Bullock and Gary Smith (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1996), pp. 401-424 (pp. 405, 407).

³⁴ Syllepsis is 'a figure by which a word... is made to refer to two or more other words in the same sentence'; antanaclasis is 'a figure of speech, when the same word is repeated in a different, if not in a contrary signification'. Both definitions from the *OED*. Andrew Gurr gives numerous examples: see *Henry V*, ed. Gurr, p. 14.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

are reminded of the Chorus's England 'Guarded with grandsires, babies and old women' (3.0.20) which we have heard just before; even the order in which the people are mentioned is preserved. Graham Holderness remembers that:

at one point in the original Royal Shakespeare Company stage production [of Branagh's *Henry V*], Henry and the chorus, in a brilliant *coup de théâtre*, almost bumped into one another, miming a surprised double-take of *near recognition*: with a shock of delight we suddenly saw the fictional world of the dramatic action suddenly enter the fictionalising activity of the chorus.³⁶

Just as the Chorus shared in Henry's seizure of time by 'playing the interim', the Chorus's language also shares in some of Henry's powerful attempts to create memories, to which I now turn.

The St. Crispin's Day speech is a prime example of Henry's attempt to create memories of the future, to jump-start forward recollection via an extended, uninterrupted address to his auditors, both those on the stage with him, and those in the audience. Although the speech is famous and oft-quoted, it repays a close reading of the ways in which its language can work to create and complicate memories, and particularly forward recollection.

This day is called the feast of Crispian.
He that outlives this day and comes safe home
Will stand a-tiptoe when this day is named
And rouse him at the name of Crispian.
He that shall see this day and live old age
Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours,
And say 'Tomorrow is Saint Crispian.'
Then shall he strip his sleeve and show his scars,
And say, 'These wounds I had on Crispin's day.'
Old men forget; yet all shall be forgot
But he'll remember, with advantages,
What feats he did that day. Then shall our names,
Familiar in his mouth as household words,
Harry the King, Bedford and Exeter,
Warwick and Talbot, Salisbury and Gloucester,
Be in their flowing cups freshly remembered.
This story shall the good man teach his son,
And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by
From this day to the ending of the world
But we in it shall be remembered,

³⁶ Graham Holderness, *Cultural Shakespeare: Essays in the Shakespeare Myth* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001), p. 70, my emphasis.

We few, we happy few, we band of brothers.
For he today that sheds his blood with me
Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile,
This day shall gentle his condition.
And gentlemen in England now abed
Shall think themselves accursed they were not here,
And hold their manhoods cheap whiles any speaks
That fought with us upon Saint Crispin's day.
(4.3.40-67)

The speech is a masterful piece of rhetoric, the five repeated instances of 'forget' and 'remember' pointing out its task of instructing the soldiers – and also the audience – how they are to conceive what they are experiencing. If we break the speech into its constituent parts we can see more clearly how it attempts to produce these future memories.

Henry begins his speech by stating that, 'This day is called the feast of Crispian' (4.3.40). While the feast of the brothers Saint Crispin and Crispinian (not, as Shakespeare has it, Crispian, which suits his blank verse better) on October 25th was celebrated in Catholic Henry's era, it was not celebrated in Protestant Elizabethan England.³⁷ It has been argued that by engaging with the feast of 'Crispian' in this speech, Henry attempts to 'displace or appropriate a religious holiday with a secular one in a bid to substantiate national identity.'³⁸ Indeed, as Henry imagines his soldiers remembering this day there is no mention of religious celebration of any sort:

He that outlives this day and comes safe home
Will stand a-tiptoe when this day is named
And rouse him at the name of Crispian.
(4.3.41-3)

The break at the end of this sentence provides a pause during which Henry's audiences (both on stage and in the auditorium) can envisage the promised time, can picture the scene, the coming safe home and the tip-toe stance. The thought is continued in the next sentence:

³⁷ The brothers, who were possibly twins, are the patron saints of cobblers and tanners. Legend has it that they were born to a noble family in Rome, but went as missionaries to preach Christianity to the Gauls in Soissons, making shoes by night to fund their activities and help the poor. They were tortured and then beheaded by the governor in 285 or 286 A.D., during the reign of Diocletian.

³⁸ Alison A. Chapman, 'Whose Saint Crispin's Day Is It?: Shoemaking, Holiday Making, and the Politics of Memory in Early Modern England', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54:4 (Winter, 2001), 1467-94 (p. 1467).

He that shall see this day and live old age
Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours,
And say 'Tomorrow is Saint Crispian.'
(4.3.44-6)

Henry stacks up his tower of anticipated reminiscences by mirroring the previous sentence, using symplece: a combination of anaphora ('He', 'Will' and 'And') and epistrophe ('Crispian'). The mirroring enacts the endurance of the memories evoked here. By using the same words, remembered from the preceding three lines, Henry further refines the memories he is trying to create: this time we see old age, a fantastic feast surrounded by friends, and a proud recollection of Saint Crispian. Indeed, as with the Chorus, the enlisting of the imagination is one of Henry's main means of evoking memories, as his next sentence shows:

Then shall he strip his sleeve and show his scars,
And say, 'These wounds I had on Crispin's day.'
(4.3.47-8)

The repetition of 'And' (lines 43, 46 and 48) links this sentence to the two previous ones. The sentence's brevity may be dictated by its subject matter: it is one of only two in the speech which indicate the pain and bloodshed to follow (the other is line 61, 'he that sheds his blood with me'). However, by evoking the image of his soldiers displaying their battle scars, Henry reduces the permanent injury and death - the 'legs and arms and heads chopped off in battle' - prophesied by Williams (4.1.135-6) to a transitory hardship which can be overcome and then transformed into a source of enduring pride. Pistol proves that Henry's prediction will not be fulfilled, at least by him, when he tells us he will go back to England and swear that his 'cudgelled scars' (5.1.89) from Fluellen were gained in 'Gallia wars' (l. 90), not at Agincourt specifically, let alone 'on Crispin's day.' Thus Henry's promise is revealed as vulnerable to the lies and misrepresentations of others. In prescribing the memories of his soldiers, Henry does not allow for the possibility that the memories of others might be somewhat different from those he envisages. Pistol defuses Henry's proposal of memories, and not because of the reason Henry ascribes to forgetfulness - old age:

Old men forget; yet all shall be forgot
But he'll remember, with advantages,
What feats he did that day.

Here the speech returns to the three-line form but employs a new repeated word, 'forget'. The similar placement of the caesura in the first two lines of this passage is both syntactic and deictic, transforming the passage into a caesura-to-caesura line with the feel of rocking lineation, as we hear the rhythmic counterpoints of the actual verse lines.³⁹ This rocking lineation prepares us for the litany that follows:

Then shall our names,
Familiar in his mouth as household words,
Harry the King, Bedford and Exeter,
Warwick and Talbot, Salisbury and Gloucester,
Be in their flowing cups freshly remembered.

(4.3.51-5)

This sentence, the longest so far, involves a release of memories. It modifies the preceding sentence by sharing (and finishing) the same line of verse. The focus moves from 'what feats he [the common soldier] did that day' to 'our [the nobility's] names'. We glimpse Henry attempting to forge if not the reality then at least the illusion or the memory of a 'band of brothers' through language. Although we may have forgotten them now, this litany of great nobles acquires the character of a memorial service in which a list of names is repeated. This has a powerful effect, particularly for those members of the contemporary audience who could recall the chief protagonists of the first tetralogy – after all, 'Warwick and Talbot are not otherwise mentioned in this play.'⁴⁰ Henry foresees a time when these names will be important, which is the time of the play's performance. The names summon up metonymically a whole generation of English aristocrats. Later in the play, York's dying embrace with Suffolk (4.6.7-32) gives their names a pathos and significance which makes up for their not being mentioned in the Agincourt speech. Yet the allusion to 'flowing cups' may remind us that, as Falstaff and his alehouse cronies demonstrate, intoxication is as likely to lead to forgetting as to remembering.

By having 'he' (the common soldier) and 'our' (the king and his nobles) sharing a line (l. 51), a democratic correlation between the two is effected, uniting Harry Le

³⁹ John Anthony Cuddon and Clare Preston, *Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (London: Blackwell, 1998), p. 105.

⁴⁰ Gurr, *Henry V*, p. 175.

Roy (the soldier) with Henry V (the King). Henry continues to think about the actual men who will fight his battle in the next sentence:

This story shall the good man teach his son,
And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by
From this day to the ending of the world
But we in it shall be remembered,
We few, we happy few, we band of brothers.
(4.3.56-60)

The semi-fictional status of the battle revealed by the phrase 'remember, with advantages' (l. 50), which means 'remember, with embellishments', is again admitted in the statement 'this *story* shall the good man teach his son'; and the word 'good' simultaneously congratulates those who join Henry in this act of forward recollection, and condemns those who will not. Story-telling in this context becomes a corporate activity, which repeats the original act of war. Henry knows that memories evaporate if not refreshed from time to time; they need to be passed on down the generations if they are to survive in popular memory and not just in written chronicles.

In the next line Henry rolls the two saints' names into one, 'Crispin Crispian'. The ploc seeks to impress the names of the saints upon the minds of his audience so that they will be remembered 'From this day to the ending of the world.' But while Agincourt itself 'burned in the national memory as having ascended the brightest heaven of invention of English martial pride and continental achievement,'⁴¹ St. Crispian's Day was, ironically, not remembered for the victory at Agincourt in the Elizabethan era. So Henry's promise that 'Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by | From this day to the ending of the world | But we in it shall be remembered', was, strictly speaking, not fulfilled. Yet as long as Shakespeare's play is read and discussed it will remain in the memory and those who remember will know when it was and why it was significant for those men. The stirring thought that 'this day', its events and people, will be remembered 'to the ending of the world' is largely achieved by this speech and the play of which it is a part.

In the repetition of 'we' in lines 56-60 Henry again endeavours to fuse the common soldier (he') and the nobility ('our') of line 51, into the 'happy' 'band of

⁴¹ Chris Fitter, 'A Tale of Two Branaghs: *Henry V*, Ideology, and the Mekong Agincourt', in *Shakespeare Left and Right*, ed. Ivo Kamps (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), p. 259.

brothers' that his speech has previously hinted at. But this happiness is bought at a price – bloodshed:

For he today that sheds his blood with me
Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile,
This day shall gentle his condition.

(4.3.61-3)

Finally Henry shows how he will produce the comradeship of equals he speaks of – by raising base born soldiers to his regal level. The 'royal fellowship' (4.8.102) of blood, shed together, forms a brotherhood that ennobles the common soldier. Henry unites rhetorically all those who spill their blood, be they 'vile' or 'gentle'.⁴² But the promise that fighting at Agincourt with Henry 'shall gentle' the condition of the common soldiers is not borne out by what follows: on receiving the roll of the dead after the battle has finished, Henry names 'Edward Duke of York; the Earl of Suffolk; | Sir Richard Keighly; Davy Gam, esquire; | None else of name' (4.8.104-6). Phyllis Rackin points out that 'the play ultimately erases the memory of the plebeian men that fought and died on Henry's behalf'.⁴³ And it is the 'gentlemen', not the commoners, upon whom Henry continues to comment in his speech before the battle:

And gentlemen in England now abed
Shall think themselves accursed they were not here,
And hold their manhoods cheap whiles any speaks
That fought with us upon Saint Crispin's day.

(4.3.64-67)

The 'Shall' of this final sentence links it to the previous one, while the repetition of 'And' and 'Shall' reminds us of the beginning of the speech, as does the final echo of the name 'Crispin'. Throughout this speech Henry has made his language work hard to create his vision of the battle. His version of the battle is available in the present (at the moment of giving the speech), in the near future (when the battle will occur), and in the distant future (in the way it will be remembered as a past event). Henry is not only attempting to create 'new templates for experiencing time'⁴⁴ but is also invigorating himself and his soldiers by re-inventing them as royal men. He does this by

⁴² 'Noble [. . .] comes from *non vile* (not vile); wherefore *nobile* (noble) is as it were *non vile* (not vile).' Dante Alighieri, *The Banquet (Il Convito)* (Hamburg: Tredition Classics, 2011), Chapter XVI, 6.

⁴³ Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990), p. 227.

⁴⁴ Chapman, 'Whose Saint Crispin's Day Is It?', p. 1467.

explaining to them who they will have been, when they look back on this day from the future.

Jonathan Baldo contends that Henry must forecast the future exclusively on his own terms, that his speech is required in order to keep the keys to collective memory, because it is critical to his power: 'control over how a nation remembers a momentous event like a war is almost as significant as the outcome of the war itself.'⁴⁵ While it is true that '[m]ost of the battles in the play are over memory'⁴⁶ I prefer to see 'battles' not only in Baldo's sense, as a forceful grab for the power of memories to realise and consolidate national history and identity, but also as an urgent fight to accommodate the differing versions of events that exist within the memories of the characters and the audience, because however much they differ, as memories they are equally valid. In this fight it is not necessary to reconcile the heroic with the cynical; the speech's active creation of memories can be read both positively and negatively at the same time; heroic possibilities co-exist with the possibility of more ironic readings of the speech. This reading can accommodate a wide range of views which are not mutually exclusive like Norman Rabkin's 'rabbit-duck'.⁴⁷ An entirely cynical reading of the Agincourt oration, such as Baldo's, excludes the visceral dynamic of this speech. This dynamic has been exploited and amplified by Olivier, Branagh and others who portray the heroic side of Henry, as well by generations of spectators who have come away from the play feeling elated and inspired. I hope I have shown that this feeling is created not only through what is said but through the way that the speech creates indelible memories.

Henry's problem is that the glory of his victory will be tainted by future events which he cannot envisage and which are beyond his control, as the Epilogue of the play reveals. Henry misunderstands not only his proleptic power, but also the purpose of imagining the future, because 'repetition is awaiting the arrival of the new, and welcoming it, if it should arrive. It is precisely not scouring the past for the source of its echo. [. . .] In repetition, one faces forwards precisely because retracing one's steps won't work.'⁴⁸ Henry would have his auditors, in their future remembering, look back

⁴⁵ Jonathan Baldo, 'Wars of Memory in *Henry V*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 47:2 (Summer, 1996), 132-59 (p. 133).

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁴⁷ Norman Rabkin, 'Chapter 2: Either/Or: Responding to *Henry V*', in *Shakespeare and the Problem of Meaning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), pp. 33-62.

⁴⁸ Kierkegaard, *Repetition*, p. xii.

to 'retrace their steps'; he does not – or cannot - visualise them recollecting forwards in the truly liberating way which the Chorus allows.

Conclusion

In *Henry V* the creation of memories, both past and future, is the principal objective of the play. Any conclusive ending it might seem to offer is unravelled by the Epilogue, but the play nevertheless provides a fitting conclusion to the second tetralogy, since it is absorbed by considerations of memories and identity, memories and time, and memories and the dead.

Henry V engages with the impact of memories on identity which I considered in my chapter on *Richard II*. His own identity and the identities of his soldiers are closely tied to the way Agincourt will be remembered in the future. And Henry agonises about his own identity in an existential crisis after he speaks to Williams, Court, and Bates (4.1.227-281). *Henry V* also considers the relationship of memories to time which I reflected on in my chapter on *I Henry IV*. We have a sense of the play's location on a time-line, with the rest of the second tetralogy preceding it, and the historical events of the first tetralogy yet to come, but the memories the play creates escape complete confinement to this chronological juncture by being simultaneously memories of the future (of Henry's onstage audience), of the past (of Henry's offstage audience) and of the present (remembered by us now). *Henry V* also reflects on the commemoration of the dead which I discussed in my chapter on *2 Henry IV*. At the close of the battle the army begins to commemorate the dead. From a Catholic perspective, commemoration of the dead redeems the remembered through the Requiem Mass, whose principal objective was to pray for the repose of the souls of the departed. The dead were saved from 'the terrifying prospect of purgatorial torment'⁴⁹ by prayer and above all by the sacrifice of the Mass, which was often paid for out of their estate. Although this recourse was no longer available to most Elizabethans, having been excised from the Protestant mourning rites prescribed for the bereaved, Henry explicitly remembers it when he commands 'Do we all holy rites. | Let there be sung *Non Nobis* and *Te Deum*, | The dead with charity enclosed in clay' (4.8.123-5). Henry thereby shows how

⁴⁹ Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), p. 22.

important memories are, not only for the dead, but also for the living, to enable them to mourn the deceased and get on with their life, in lending it a sense of purpose and continuity. Despite the deaths of their comrades, the soldiers return to England elated: the Chorus takes us 'to Calais, and to England then, | Where ne'er from France arrived more *happy men*' (4.8.126-7, my emphasis).

Henry V solicits contemplation of the future through forward recollection. The speeches of the Chorus and Henry's speech at Agincourt are quite different in their method and effectiveness. The Chorus does not forecast the future in the way Carlisle, Gaunt, Prince Hal or even Henry V in this play do, but he facilitates the audience's use of their own imaginations. Thus, it is not only the main characters of *Henry V*, but also those listening to them, whose powers of anticipation are activated. Henry, on the other hand, is more like the characters of the previous plays in the tetralogy who attempt to define the future they see: he encourages others to find the future as *he* finds it, which, even if it is a positive future, is narrow and prescriptive. Henry does not allow his soldiers to devise their own futures, but foretells a future which follows the precedents of the past: in this case, a victory to rival that of his 'grandfather of famous memory' (4.7.91), Edward III, and his 'great-uncle Edward the Plack [sic] Prince of Wales' (4.7.92-3). The Epilogue proves that such predictions cannot be fulfilled in the long term, and Pistol shows us that a future of the type Henry prescribes is all too easy to disregard. Although the Chorus encourages and Henry initiates forward recollection, only the former succeeds in revealing the radical possibilities of prolepsis as a means of escaping memories that are purely retrospective.

It is fitting to return, at the close of this chapter, to Kierkegaard. Reflecting on the wider application of Kierkegaard's concept of forward recollection to our lives, Edward F. Mooney writes:

I await something momentous, gathered as the future unveils towards me. [...] Without repetition or recollection, Constantine tells us, 'all life is dissolved into an empty, meaningless noise' (p. 19). Kierkegaard wants us to feel the allure of true repetition.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ Kierkegaard, *Repetition*, p. xiii.

The allure of 'true repetition', of forward recollection, lies in its confirmation that 'there is no determinism that governs the future'⁵¹ and its implicit endorsement of the Chorus's liberating injunction: 'Play with your fancies' (3.0.7).

⁵¹ Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, *Flight to Arras* (New York: Harcourt, 1989), p. 130.

CHAPTER EIGHT:
CONCLUSION: MEMORY IN THE SECOND TETRALOGY

The plays of the second tetralogy can be and have been read against the memory treatises of the time in which they were written.¹ But this thesis is the first sustained study of memory in all four plays of the second tetralogy which explores how the plays produce an awareness in their audience of how memories are created and complicated by Shakespeare's choice of story, characterisation, and above all, language. This thesis shows the vital roles played by memory and the multifaceted significance of memory in Shakespeare's second tetralogy.

All too often in the second tetralogy we see characters who appear trapped by their memories of the past, who either allow past history to dictate their present behaviour and their future fates, or fall victim to it, without recognising that those manifold memories could free them from such destinies. Richard basing his subjectivity on the precepts of his royal predecessors, steering him to deposition; Hal imagining a future which has already been decided, leading to Falstaff's dismissal; Hotspur failing to understand that time can be understood in a different way, contributing to his death; Northumberland using his memories of the dead to decide his present course of action, causing him to abandon his fellow rebels on the battlefield: all these characters show the perils of and trouble with past memories. But in the second tetralogy, Shakespeare also pluralises, questions and at times even falsifies history through the contested, fluid memories of characters such as Falstaff, Shallow, and the Chorus, and not only through their rehearsals, improvisations and revisions - the stories they tell about the past and their place in it - but also through their verbal idiom, through the form of the language they use.

As my first chapter showed, previous studies of memory in early modern literature, and in Shakespeare in particular, have not analysed in a sustained manner the way memories are manufactured in the second tetralogy. This thesis differs from

¹ Most notably by Lina Perkins Wilder, *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre: Recollection, Properties, and Character* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

previous studies in the depth and the detail of its investigation, offering close readings of key moments of the plays to show how diction, syntax, and rhetoric can create and complicate memory.

My second chapter offered definitions of the key terms of history and memory. I have been careful in this thesis to distinguish between history and memory. History is broad; it consists of events as they are recorded in chronicles and annals. Yet for the characters of the plays, what counts as history is dependent on memories which are always contestable. Memories are multiple recollections of what happened. In the case of the plays, memories are also often oral, which is why drama is so suited to their dissemination. This is something I examined more fully in my third chapter, which considered the locations, activities, actors and audiences of drama, all of which are indispensable to the production of memory in the plays.

My third chapter also took the opportunity to discuss what kind of historian Shakespeare is while writing the second tetralogy. Shakespeare equips his audience to maintain their scepticism about history, and to continually question the truth or otherwise of the historical memories presented before them. The characters of the second tetralogy produce an alternative historiography which is not homogeneous or monolithic. The plays of the second tetralogy can be and have been read in a way which sees them as producing history as a shared, national memory.² But the plays actually show that history as a shared memory is polyphonic and open to revision at any point. The plays acknowledge and allow for the power, importance and pleasure of their epic events, such as the victory at Shrewsbury and Agincourt, but the audience is entitled – indeed, encouraged – to test their credibility; we can be critical of both the characters' version of history, and Shakespeare's in choosing what is included from his sources and what is excluded. The characters often make history through memories before the audience's very eyes, but by arming them with an acute self-consciousness Shakespeare allows them to contest the veracity of the memories presented before them. Moreover, by disabusing the audience of the notion that the past is fixed, the plays allow that the future can likewise be different from what is expected or demanded. In contrast to previous studies, this thesis has revealed points in the plays

² For example, by Jonathan Baldo, *Memory in Shakespeare's Histories: Stages of Forgetting in Early Modern England* (New York and Oxon: Routledge, 2012).

where the Kierkegaardian concept of 'forward recollection' can be used to explain the part played by memories of the future.

As my fourth chapter showed, memory in the second tetralogy complicates and problematises identity, producing discontinuous and divided characters, as exemplified by Richard II's loss of kingship. My fifth chapter showed how the way the characters understand time can affect how they imagine their past and their future, and indeed, can be the deciding factor in their concept of life. My sixth chapter considered memory and death. Throughout the tetralogy characters use the commemoration of the dead as a political tool, as an impetus to continued rebellion or combat, but ultimately the plays 'turn away from the illusion that man's existence in history is faithfully rendered in the huge public stylizations of historical tragedy.'³ Instead we are offered the 'faithful' private reminiscences of Justice Shallow, through whom Shakespeare suggests that past memories of the dead need not determine the actions of the living. Shakespeare's cue-words also ensure that his actors share in the tentativeness of memory as it unfolds for his characters, once again exposing how memory works. My seventh chapter underscored the importance of forward recollection in the other plays by showing how the Chorus summons the audience to lift its gaze to the horizon of the future. The Chorus offers us a form of remembrance which is not fixed on the past but which holds out the promise of a future made possible by limitless imagination.

I believe that the approach I have adopted in this thesis could be fruitfully applied to other plays in the canon. While writing this thesis I was often reminded by the characters' phrasing of Macbeth, who on being given the news that his wife is dead exclaims:

She should have died hereafter:
There would have been a time for such a word.—
To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
To the last syllable of recorded time;
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
Life's but a walking shadow; a poor player,
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,

³ Sheldon P. Zitner, 'Aumerle's Conspiracy', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 14:2 (Spring, 1974), 239-257 (p. 255).

And then is heard no more: it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.⁴

Not unlike Hotspur, Macbeth is trapped in a time when 'all our yesterdays' – the precepts and memories of the past - have 'lighted fools | The way to dusty death.' Not unlike Hal, Macbeth's 'To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow' is enslaved to something akin to the written chronicles, 'the last syllable of recorded time'.⁵ Not unlike Richard II, Macbeth feels himself to be ultimately 'nothing', living life as a 'shadow', an actor, 'a poor player, | That struts and frets his hour upon the stage'. Macbeth's speech moves from the future perfect tense ('there would have been a time') through the present tense ('to-morrow | Creeps in', the future impinging on today) to the past ('our yesterdays have lighted fools'). Both retrospective memories (of his 'yesterdays'), and future anticipation (of his 'tomorrows' and his ultimate fate) are circulating in his speech. They drive his use of past, present, and future tenses in order to explain his identity, reveal his perception of time, betray his understanding of death, and situate himself in relation to his future.

I chose the second tetralogy as the object of my study of memory in Shakespeare because as history plays they are overtly and deeply involved in dramatising remembered people, places and events. The past is their subject matter and their setting. But I was also attracted to them by the fact that, though we cannot be certain that when Shakespeare wrote *Richard II* he envisaged the other plays of the tetralogy that follow it, it is plain that when Heminge and Condell came to arrange the First Folio they saw the plays of the second tetralogy as a sequence and grouped them together. They chose not to arrange the plays in the order in which they were written or acted, and they chose not to put *Richard II* in with the other tragedies such as *Macbeth*, even though the 1597 Quarto labels it a 'Tragedie'. They also decided not to put any of Roman plays in with the Histories. Heminge and Condell invited the reader to recognise the tetralogical structure of the plays, which means that the reader's memory is activated when they make conscious connections between the individual plays. As Harry Berger observes:

⁴ William Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, ed. Kenneth Muir, Arden second series (London: Thomson Learning, 2001), 5.5.17-28. Subsequent references are to this edition.

⁵ I acknowledge 'recorded time' could also be a reference to the Christian concept of the time allotted before the last judgment.

the third and fourth plays not only presuppose the material of the first two, they represent and continually revise that material, entraining a dialectic between each play and its predecessors. This demands more of us than reading to refresh our memory; it demands a process of reinterpretation that sends us back and forth between the earlier and later plays in order to determine (1) how the characters' motives and interests affect their memory, and (2) whether the themes and emphases of the earlier plays are substantially altered by their development in the later plays.⁶

I have established that the audience's alertness to instances of textual anticipation and forward recollection in the plays is affected by any memories they may have about the characters and events from previous accounts or performance, by whether they know the plays' prequels and sequels within the tetralogy, and by whether they are seeing or hearing the plays for the first time. But I have also shown that, even if the members of audience have absolutely no fore-knowledge of the characters or events, these history plays ensure that 'their eyes are carried beyond the supporters and opponents they have to deal with to a vision of a future in which things can be made different.'⁷ The second tetralogy's creation and presentation of both retrospective and prospective memory enhances the audience's capacity to see the possibility that the way things have been is not the way they had to be or must remain. In this thesis I trust I have provided support for those who see in Shakespeare's second tetralogy the 'vision of a future in which things can be made different',⁸ unshackled from the precepts of the past and unhindered by the expectations of a future void of imagination.

⁶ Harry Berger, 'On the Continuity of the Henriad: A Critique of Some Literary and Theatrical Approaches', in *Shakespeare Left and Right*, ed. Ivo Kamps (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 225-40 (pp. 236-7).

⁷ G. K. Hunter, 'Notes on the Genre of the History Play', in *Shakespeare's English Histories: A Quest for Form and Genre*, ed. John W. Velz (Binghamton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Text Studies, 1996), pp. 229-40 (p. 240).

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Albott, Robert, 'Of Wit and Memory', in *Wits Theatre of the Little World* (London: Nicholas Ling, 1599).
- Alighieri, Dante, *The Banquet (Il Convito)* (Hamburg: Tredition Classics, 2011).
- Bacon, Francis, *The Essays*, ed. and intro. John Pitcher (London: Penguin, 1985).
- Erasmus, Desiderius, *Selections from Erasmus: Principally from his Epistles*, ed. P. S. Allen (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923).
- Fludd, Robert, *Utriusque Cosmi majoris scilicet et minoris metaphysica atque technica historia in duo volumina secundum cosmi differentiam divisa* (London: 1619).
- The Geneva Bible, Facsimile 1560 Edition: The Bible of the Protestant Reformation* (Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007).
- Gratarolo, Guglielmo, *The castel of memorie wherein is conteyned the restoring, augmenting, and conseruing of the memorye and remembraunce, with the safest remedies, and best preceptes therevnto in any wise apperteyning: made by Gulielmus Gratarolus Bergomatis Doctor of Artes and Phisike. Englished by Willyam Fulvvod. The contentes whereof appeare in the page next folovvyng*, trans. William Fulwood (London: Roawland Hall, 1562). Manuscript: London: British Library, STC (2nd ed.) / 12191.
- Meres, Francis, *Palladis Tamia Wits Treasury* (London: Cuthbert Burbie, 1598).
- Nashe, Thomas, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. Ronald B. McKerrow (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966).
- Petrus, Ravennas, *The art of memory, that otherwyse is called the Phenix A boke very behouefull and profytable to all professours of scyences. Grammaryens, rethoryciens dialectyke, legystes, phylosophres [and] theologiens*, trans. Robert Copland (London: William Middleton, 1545). Manuscript: Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, STC (2nd ed.) / 24112.
- Willis, John, *Memonica; sive Ars Reminiscendi: e puris artis naturaeque fontiubus hausta* (London: Humphrey Lownes, 1618).
- , *The Art of Memory* (London: William Jones 1621).
- , *Mnemonica: or, The Art of Memory* (London: Leonard Sowersby, 1661).
- Shakespeare, William, *All's Well that Ends Well*, ed. Susan Snyder (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- , *As You Like It*, ed. Alan Brissenden (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- , *The Comedy of Errors*, ed. T. S. Dorsch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- , *Cymbeline*, ed. Martin Butler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- , *The First Part of King Henry IV*, ed. Herbert Weil and Judith Weil (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- , *Hamlet*, ed. Harold Jenkins (London: Thomson Learning, 2000).
- , *Henry IV Part One*, ed. David Scott Kastan, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2002).
- , *Henry IV Part One*, ed. David Bevington (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

- , *Henry IV Part Two*, ed. A. R. Humphreys, Arden second series (London: Thomson Learning, 2003).
- , *Henry IV Part Two*, ed. Rene Weis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- , *Henry V*, ed. T. W. Craik, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2005).
- , *Henry V*, ed. Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- , *King Henry V*, ed. Andrew Gurr (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- , *King Lear*, ed. R. A. Foakes, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2003).
- , *King Richard II*, ed. Andrew Gurr (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- , *Macbeth*, ed. Kenneth Muir, Arden second series (London: Thomson Learning, 2001).
- , *Measure for Measure*, ed. J. W. Lever, Arden second series (London: Thomson Learning, 2004).
- , *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. Harold Brooks, Arden second series (London: Thomson Learning, 2000).
- , *Othello*, ed. E. A. J. Honigmann, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2001).
- , *Pericles*, ed. Suzanne Gossett, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2005).
- , *Richard II*, ed. Charles R. Forker, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 2005).
- , *Richard II*, ed. Anthony B. Dawson and Paul Yachnin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- , *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. T. J. B. Spencer (London: Penguin, 2005).
- , *The Second Part of King Henry IV*, ed. Giorgio Melchiori (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- , *The Tempest*, ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan, Arden third series (London: Thomson Learning, 1999).
- , *Troilus and Cressida*, ed. David Bevington, Arden third series (Thomson Learning: London, 2004).
- , *The Winter's Tale*, ed. Stephen Orgel (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- Sidney, Philip, *The Defence of Poesy and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Gavin Alexander (London: Penguin, 2004).
- Spenser, Edmund, *The Faerie Queene, Book 1*, ed. and intro. Carol V. Kaske (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2006).
- Quintilian, Marcus Fabius, *Institutio Oratoria* (Charleston, South Carolina: Forgotten Books, 1999).
- Unknown author (attributed to Cicero), *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1999).

Secondary Sources

- Alexander, Catherine M. S. (ed.), *Shakespeare and Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Alteri, Joanne, 'Romance in *Henry V*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 21:2 (Spring, 1989), 223-40.
- Altick, Richard D., 'Symphonic Imagery in *Richard II*', *PMLA*, 62:2 (June, 1947), 339-365.
- Anderson, Thomas P., *Performing Early Modern Trauma from Shakespeare to Milton* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006).
- , 'Class, Class Consciousness and Spectres of Marx in Shakespeare's History plays',

- Literature Compass* 1 (2004), 1-12.
- Austin, John Langshaw, *How to Do Things With Words*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2005).
- Avishai, Margalit, *The Ethics of Memory* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2004).
- , *Memory in Shakespeare's Histories: Stages of Forgetting in Early Modern England* (New York and Oxon: Routledge, 2012).
- Baker, David, "'Wildehirissheman': Colonialist Representation in Shakespeare's *Henry V*", *English Literary Renaissance* 22 (1992).
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. H. Iswolski (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984).
- , 'On the Concept of History', in *Selected Writings: Volume 4 1938-1940*, trans. Edmund Jephcott and others, ed. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings (Cambridge, MA. and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006), pp. 389-411.
- Baldo, Jonathan, *Memory in Shakespeare's Histories: Stages of Forgetting in Early Modern England* (New York and London: Routledge, 2012).
- , 'Wars of Memory in *Henry V*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 47:2 (Summer, 1996), 132-59.
- Barber, C. L., *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy: A Study of Dramatic Form and its Relation to Social Custom* (Princeton, N. J.; Princeton University Press, 1972).
- Barish, Jonas, 'Remembering and Forgetting in Shakespeare', *Elizabethan Theatre: Essays in Honour of S. Schoenbaum*, ed. R. B. Parker and S. P. Zitner (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), 214-221.
- Bate, Jonathan, *The Genius of Shakespeare* (Basingstoke: Picador, 1998).
- , *Soul of the Age: The Life, Mind and World of William Shakespeare* (London and New York: Penguin, 2008).
- Bell, Duncan, *Memory, Trauma and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).
- Bennett, H. S., *Shakespeare's Audience* (London: Milford, 1944).
- Bennett, Robert B., 'Four Stages of Time: The Shape of History in Shakespeare's Second Tetralogy', *Shakespeare Studies*, 19 (1987), 61-85.
- Benjamin, Walter, 'A Berlin Chronicle', in *Selected Writings 1927-1930: Volume 2 Part 1*, ed. Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland and Gary Smith (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2005).
- , 'On the Concept of History', in *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 4, 1938-1940*, ed. Marcus Paul Bullock and Gary Smith (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1996).
- , *One-Way Street and Other Writings*, trans. Edmund Jephcott and Kingsley Shorter (London: Verso, 1979).
- Berger Jr., Harry, *Imaginary Audition: Shakespeare on Stage and Page* (London: University of California Press, 1989).
- , *Making Trifles of Terrors: Redistributing Complicities in Shakespeare* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997).
- , 'On the Continuity of the Henriad: A Critique of Some Literary and Theatrical Approaches', in *Shakespeare Left and Right*, ed. Ivo Kamps (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 225-40.
- , 'Representing the Limits of Theatre in *Richard II*', *Theatre Journal*, 39:2 (May, 1987), 135-155.

- , 'Richard II 3.2: An Exercise in Imaginary Audition', *ELH*, 55:4 (1988), 755-96.
- Bergeron, David M., 'Shakespeare Makes History: 2 Henry IV', *SEL*, 31 (1991), 231-45.
- Berry, Phillipa, 'Between Idolatry and Astrology: Modes of Temporal Repetition in *Romeo and Juliet*', in *A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. Dympha Callaghan (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 358-371.
- Black, James, 'The interlude of the beggar and the king', in *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, ed. David M. Bergeron (Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1985), pp. 104-113.
- Blau, Herbert, *The Audience* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).
- Bloom, Harold, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human Being* (London: Fourth Estate, 1999).
- Bobbio, Norberto, *Old Age and Other Essays*, trans. and ed. Allan Cameron (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Booth, Stephen, 'Shakespeare's Language and the Language of Shakespeare's Time', *Shakespeare Survey 50: Shakespeare and Language* (1997), 1-18.
- Borinski, Ludwig, 'Shakespeare's Comic Prose', *Shakespeare Survey 20: Shakespearean and Other Tragedies* (2002), 57-73.
- , 'Shakespeare's Conception of History', *Bulletin de la Faculte des Lettres*, 43 (May, 1965), 835-854.
- Boswell-Stone, W. G., *Shakespeare's Holinshed: The Chronicle and the Historical Plays Compared* (London: Lawrence and Bullen, 1896).
- Boym, Svetlana, *The Future of Nostalgia* (New York: BasicBooks, 2001).
- Branagh, Kenneth, *Henry V Screenplay* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1989).
- Brode, Douglas, *Shakespeare in the Movies: From the Silent Era to Today* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Brook, Peter, *Evoking (and Forgetting) Shakespeare* (Nick Hern Books; London, 2002).
- Brooke, Nicholas, *Richard II* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1973).
- Brunner, Karl, 'Middle-class Attitudes in Shakespeare's Histories', *Shakespeare Survey 6: The Histories* (1953), 36-8.
- Bruster, Douglas, *To Be Or Not To Be* (London: Continuum, 2007).
- Budra, Paul, 'Writing the Tragic Self: Richard II's Sad Stories', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 18 (1994), 5-15.
- Bullough, Geoffrey, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, Volume 4 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960).
- Burnett, M. T., and R. Wray (eds), 'From the Horse's Mouth: Branagh on the Bard', in *Shakespeare, Film, Fin de Siecle* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), pp. 165-78.
- Byatt, A. S., and Harriet Harvey Wood (eds), *Memory: An Anthology* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2008).
- Callow, Simon, *Actors on Shakespeare: Henry IV Part I* (London: Faber and Faber, 2002).
- , *Actors on Shakespeare: Henry IV Part II* (London: Faber and Faber, 2003).
- Camden, Carrol, 'Memory, the Warder of the Brain', *Philological Quarterly*, 18:1 (January, 1939), 52-72.
- Cannon, Walter W., 'The King's Three Bodies: the Textual King and the Logic of Obedience in *Henry V*', *The Upstart Crow* 18 (1998), 84-94.
- Carlson, Marvin A., *The Haunted Stage: The Theatre As Memory Machine* (Ann Arbor, MI.: University of Michigan Press, 2003).
- Carroll, Lewis, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass*, ed.

- Hugh Haughton, (London: Penguin Classics, 2003).
- Carruthers, Mary, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Carson, Christie and Farah Karim-Cooper (eds), *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- Caruth, Cathy (ed.), *Trauma: Explorations in Memory* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995).
- Casey, Edward S., *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study*, 2nd edn (Bloomington, IN.: Indiana University Press, 2000).
- Cavanagh, Dermot, Stuart Hampton-Reeves and Stephen Longstaffe (eds), *Shakespeare's Histories and Counter-Histories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006).
- Chapman, Alison A., 'Whose Saint Crispin's Day Is It?: Shoemaking, Holiday Making, and the Politics of Memory in Early Modern England', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54:4 (Winter, 2001), 1467-94.
- Chambers, E. K., *Shakespeare: A Survey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1926).
- Charnes, Linda, *Notorious Identity: Materializing the Subject in Shakespeare* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1993).
- Chenu, M. D., 'Auctor, actor, autor' *Bulletin du Cange* 3 (1927), 81-6.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *De Oratore* (Charleston: Bibliolife, 2008).
- Clanchy, M. T., *From Memory to Written Record, England 1066-307* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993).
- Clemen, Wolfgang H., 'Anticipation and Foreboding in Shakespeare's Early Histories', *Shakespeare Survey* 6: *The Histories* (1953), 25-35.
- , *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art: Collected Essays* (London: Methuen, 1972).
- Cohen, Derek, 'History and the Nation in *Richard II* and *Henry IV*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 42:2 (Spring, 2002), 293-315.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, *Coleridge's Criticism of Shakespeare: A Selection*, ed. R. A Foakes (London: Athlone Press, 1989).
- Connerton, Paul, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Crystal, David, *Pronouncing Shakespeare* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- , and Ben Crystal, *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary and Language Companion* (London: Penguin, 2004).
- Cuddon, John Anthony, and Clare Preston, *Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (London: Blackwell, 1998).
- Cusack, Bridget, 'Shakespeare and the Tune of the Time', *Shakespeare Survey* 23: *Shakespeare's Language* (1970), 1-12.
- Danson, Lawrence, 'Henry V: King, Chorus, and Critics', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 34:1 (Spring, 1983), 27-43.
- , *Shakespeare's Dramatic Genres* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Davies, Anthony, *Filming Shakespeare's Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- Dawson, Anthony B., 'The Arithmetic of Memory: Shakespeare's Theatre and the National Past', *Shakespeare Survey* 52: *Shakespeare and the Globe* (1999), 54-67.
- de Certeau, Michel, *The Writing of History*, trans. Tom Conley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992).

- de Romilly, Jacqueline, *Time in Greek Tragedy* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1968).
- de Saint-Exupéry, Antoine, *Flight to Arras* (New York: Harcourt, 1989).
- Dean, Leonard F., *Tudor Theories of Historical Writing* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1947).
- Deleuze, Gilles, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson (London: Athlone Press, 1983).
- Derrida, Jacques, *Spectres of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*, trans. Peggy Kamuf, intro. Bernard Magnus and Stephen Cullenberg (London and New York: Routledge, 1994).
- Desmet, Christy, 'Shakespeare the Historian', *Shakespeare Survey 63: Shakespeare's English Histories and their Afterlives* (2010), 1-11.
- Dillon, Janette, *Shakespeare and the Staging of English History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Dollimore, Jonathan, and Alan Sinfield, 'History and Ideology: The Instance of Henry V' in John Drakakis, *Alternative Shakespeares* (London: Routledge, 1985).
- Doring, Tobias, *Performances of Mourning in Shakespearean Theatre and Early Modern Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).
- Dunne, J. W., *An Experiment with Time* (London: Hampton Roads Publishing Co, 2001).
- Dutton, Richard, '17: The Second Tetralogy', in *Shakespeare: Bibliographical Guide (New Edition)* ed. Stanley Wells (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 337-380.
- Dutton, Richard, and Jean E. Howard (eds), *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works Vol. II: The Histories* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003).
- Eckert, Charles W., *Focus on Shakespearean Film* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972).
- Eco, Umberto, 'An ars oblivionalis? Forget it!', *PMLA*, 103 (1988), 254-61.
- Egan, Michael, 'Woodstock's Golden Metamorphosis', in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (London: Edwin Mellen Press, 2007), pp. 75-116.
- , (ed.), *Woodstock* (London: Edwin Mellen Press, 2006).
- Eliot, T. S., 'Tradition and the Individual Talent', in *Selected Prose* ed. Frank Kermode (London: Faber and Faber 1975).
- Enders, Jody, *The Medieval Theater Of Cruelty: Rhetoric, Memory, Violence* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999).
- Engel, William E., *Death and Drama in Renaissance England: Shades of Memory* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- , *Mapping Mortality: The Persistence of Memory and Melancholy in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, MA.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995).
- Erne, Lukas, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Estill, Laura, 'Richard II and the Book of Life', *SEL*, 51:2 (Spring, 2011), 283-303.
- Evans, Meredith, 'Rumor, the Breath of Kings, and the Body of Law in 2 Henry IV', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 60:1 (Spring, 2009), 1-24.
- Farrell, Kirby, 'Prophetic Behavior in Shakespeare's Histories', in *William Shakespeare: Histories*, ed. Harold Bloom (New York: Infobase, 2009), pp. 43-66.
- Felman, Shoshana, *The Juridical Unconscious: Trials and Traumas in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2002).
- Fernie, Ewan, 'Action! Henry V', in *Presentist Shakespeares*, ed. Hugh Grady and Terence Hawkes (London and New York: Routledge, 2006).
- Fitter, Chris, 'A Tale of Two Branaghs: Henry V, Ideology, and the Mekong Agincourt', in

- Shakespeare Left and Right*, ed. Ivo Kamps (New York and London: Routledge, 1991).
- Forker, Charles R., 'Unstable Identity in Shakespeare's *Richard II*', *Renascence*, 54:1 (Fall, 2001), 3-21.
- Forty, Adrian, and Susanne Kuchler (eds), *The Art of Forgetting* (Oxford and New York: Berg, 1999).
- Fraisse, Paul, *The Psychology of Time* (London: Harper and Row, 1964).
- Friedman, Donald M., 'John of Gaunt and the Rhetoric of Frustration', *ELH*, 43 (1976), 279-99.
- Frye, Northrop, *The Fools of Time: Studies in Shakespearean Tragedy* (London: University of Toronto Press, 1967).
- Faulkner, William, *Requiem for a Nun* (London: Random House, 2012).
- Garber, Marjorie, "'What's Past Is Prologue": Temporality and Prophecy in Shakespeare's History Plays', in *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History and Interpretation* ed. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1986), pp. 301-31.
- Grady, Hugh, *Shakespeare, Machiavelli, and Montaigne: Power and Subjectivity from Richard II to Hamlet* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- , and Terence Hawkes (eds), *Presentist Shakespeares* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006).
- Greenblatt, Stephen, 'Invisible Bullets: Renaissance Authority and its Subversion, *Henry IV* and *Henry V*', in *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), pp. 21-65.
- , 'Racial Memory and Literary History', *PMLA*, 116:1 (Jan., 2001), 48-63.
- , 'Remember Me', in *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), pp. 205-57.
- Greene, Nicholas, *Shakespeare's Serial History Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Grivelet, Michel, 'Shakespeare's "War with Time": The Sonnets and *Richard II*', *Shakespeare Survey 23: Shakespeare's Language* (1970), 69-78.
- Hacking, Ian, 'Two Souls in One Body', in *Questions of Evidence: Proof, Practise and Persuasion Across the Disciplines*, ed. J. Chandler, A. I. Davidson and H. Harootunian (Chicago: Chicago University of Press, 1994).
- Halbwachs, Maurice, *On Collective Memory*, ed. and trans. by Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
- Hallam, Elizabeth, and Jenny Hockey, *Death, Memory and Material Culture* (Oxford and New York: Berg, 2001).
- Hannay, Alastair and Gordon Daniel Marino (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Kierkegaard* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Harbage, Alfred, *Shakespeare's Audience* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941).
- Hardy, Barbara, 'Shakespeare's Narrative: Acts of Memory', *Essays in Criticism*, 39:2 (April, 1989), 93-115.
- Hawkes, Terence, 'Bryn Glas', in *Post-Colonial Shakespeares*, eds. Ania Loomba and Martin Orkin (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 117-163.
- Henderson, Diana E., *Collaborations With The Past: Reshaping Shakespeare Across Time And Media* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006).
- Heller, Agnes, *The Time is Out of Joint: Shakespeare as Philosopher of History* (Maryland, U.S.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002).
- Highley, C., *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge

- University Press, 1997).
- Hindle, Maurice, *Studying Shakespeare on Film* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).
- Hobsbaum, Philip, *Rhythm, Metre and Verse Form* (London: Routledge, 1995).
- Hockey, Dorothy C., 'A World of Rhetoric in *Richard II*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 15:3 (Summer, 1964), 179-91.
- Hodgdon, Barbara, *The End Crowns All: Closure and Contradiction in Shakespeare's History* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1991).
- Hoenselaars, Ton (ed.), *Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Holderness, Graham, (ed.), *Shakespeare's History Plays: Richard II to Henry V* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1992).
- , *Cultural Shakespeare: Essays in the Shakespeare Myth* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001).
- , *Shakespeare: The Histories* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000).
- , *Shakespeare's History* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1985).
- , *Shakespeare Recycled: the Making of Historical Drama* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992).
- , *Textual Shakespeare: Writing And The Word* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2003).
- , *Visual Shakespeare: Essays in Film and Television* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2002).
- , "'What ish my nation?': Shakespeare and National Identities', *Textual Practice*, 5 (1991), 74-93.
- , Nick Potter and John Turner, *Shakespeare: The Play of History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988).
- Holland, Peter, *Shakespeare, Memory, and Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- Howard, Jean E. and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).
- Howlett, Kathy M., *Framing Shakespeare on Film* (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2000).
- Hoyle, James, 'Some Emblems in Shakespeare's Henry IV plays', *ELH*, 38:4 (Dec., 1971), 512-527.
- Hunter, G. K., *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1970).
- Hutton, Patrick H., *History as an Art of Memory* (Burlington, VT.: University of Vermont, 1993).
- Hynes, Samuel, 'Personal Narratives and Commemoration', in *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 205-220.
- Ivic, Christopher, and Grant Williams, *Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and Culture: Lethe's Legacies* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004).
- Jackson, R., and R. Smallwood (eds), 'Henry V', in *Players of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 93 -105.
- Jardine, Alice, 'Introduction to Julia Kristeva's "Women's Time"', *Signs*, 7:1 (Autumn, 1981), 5-12.
- Jardine, Lisa, *Reading Shakespeare Historically* (London: Routledge, 1998).
- Jones, Ann, and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

- Jones, Emrys, *Scenic Form in Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).
- Jones, G. P. , "'Henry V": The Chorus and the Audience', *Shakespeare Survey* 31: *Shakespeare and the Classical World* (1979), 93-104.
- Jonson, Ben, *The Devil is an Ass and Other Plays*, ed. M. J. Kidnie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Jorgens, Jack J., *Shakespeare on Film* (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1977).
- Jorgensen, Paul A., *Redeeming Shakespeare's Words* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962).
- Kammen, Michael, *Mystic Cords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1991).
- Kamps, Ivo, *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University of Press, 1996).
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H., 'Chapter II: Shakespeare: King Richard II', in *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957), pp. 24-41.
- Karremann, Isabel, 'Rites of Oblivion in Shakespearian History Plays', *Shakespeare Survey* 63: *Shakespeare's English Histories and their Afterlives*, (2010), pp. 24-36.
- Kermode, Frank, *Shakespeare's Language* (London and New York: Penguin, 2000).
- Kernan, Alvin, 'The Henriad: Shakespeare's Major History Plays', *Yale Review* 59 (1969), 3-32.
- Kierkegaard, Søren, *Repetition and Philosophical Crumbs*, trans. M. G. Piety, intro. Edward F. Mooney (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Kinney, Arthur F., *Shakespeare by Stages: An Historical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003).
- Klett, Elizabeth, 'Many Bodies, Many Voices: Performing Androgyny in Fiona Shaw and Deborah Warner's *Richard II*', *Theatre Journal*, 58:2 (May, 2006), 175-91.
- Kristeva, Julia, 'Women's Time', in *New Maladies of the Soul*, trans. Ross Guberman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).
- Landy, Marcia (ed.), *The Historical Film: History and Memory in Media* (London: Athlone Press, 2001).
- Lawlor, John, *Tragic Sense in Shakespeare* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1960).
- Leech, Clifford, 'Shakespeare and the Idea of the Future', *University of Toronto Quarterly* 35 (1966), 213-8.
- , 'The Unity of 2 Henry IV', *Shakespeare Survey Volume 6: The Histories* (1953), 16-24.
- Lee-Jeffries, Hester, *Shakespeare and Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- Le Goff, Jacques, *History and Memory*, trans. S. Rendall and E. Claman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992).
- Lehmann, Courtney, *Shakespeare Remains: Theater to Film, Early Modern to Postmodern* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2002).
- Letier, Samuel L., *Shakespeare Around the Globe: A Guide to Notable Postwar Productions* (New York and London: Greenwood Press, 1986).
- Lewis, Tess, "'Once Is Not Enough: Rereading and Remembering": Review of *Nothing Remains the Same: Rereading and Remembering* by Wendy Lesser', *The Hudson Review*, 55:3 (Autumn, 2002), pp. 504-10.
- Liebler, Naomi Conn, "'And is Old Double Dead?": Nation and Nostalgia in *Henry IV*

- Part 2', *Shakespeare Survey 63: Shakespeare's English Histories and their Afterlives* (2010), 78-88.
- MacGregor, Neil, *Shakespeare's Restless World* (London: Allen Lane, 2012).
- Madison Cooper, John, and D. S. Hutchinson (eds), *Plato: Complete Works* (London: Hackett Publishing, 1997).
- Maguire, Laurie (ed.), *How to Do Things with Shakespeare: New Approaches, New Essays* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008).
- Mahood, Molly, *Shakespeare's Wordplay* (London: Methuen, 1957).
- Manlove, Colin N., *The Gap in Shakespeare* (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1981).
- Marston, John, *The Malcontent* (1604) (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).
- Mayer, Jean-Christophe, 'The Decline of the Chronicle and Shakespeare's History Plays', *Shakespeare Survey 63: Shakespeare's English Histories and their Afterlives* (2010), 12-23.
- McDonald, Russ, *Shakespeare and the Arts of Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- McGuire, Richard L., 'The Play-within-the-Play in 1 Henry IV', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 18:1 (Winter, 1967), 47-52.
- McLuhan, Marshal, *Understanding Media: the Extensions of Man* (Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1994).
- McMillin, Scott, 'Shakespeare's *Richard II*: Eyes of Sorrow, Eyes of Desire', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 35:1 (Spring, 1981), 10-52.
- Minola, Robert S., *Shakespeare's Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Mitchell, Giles R., and Eugene P. Wright, 'Hotspur's Poor Memory', *The South Central Bulletin*, 43:4 (Winter, 1983), 121-3.
- Moi, Toril (ed.), *The Kristeva Reader* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986).
- Moseley, C. W. R. D., *Shakespeare's History Plays: Richard II to Henry V: The Making of a King* (London: Penguin Books, 1988).
- Muir, Kenneth, 'Shakespeare and the Metamorphosis of the Pentameter', *Shakespeare Survey 50: Shakespeare and Language*, ed. Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- , *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays* (London: Routledge, 2008).
- Murphy, A., 'Shakespeare's Irish History', *Literature and History*, 3rd Series, 5 (1996), 38-59.
- Musgrove, S., 'The Birth of Pistol', *RES*, New Series, Vol. 10, 56.
- Neill, M., *Putting History into the Question: Power, Politics, and Society in English Renaissance Drama* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Gay Science* (Dover: Dover Publications, 2006).
- , 'On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life (1874)', in *Untimely Meditations*, ed. Daniel Breazeale, trans. R. J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 57-123.
- , *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for Everyone and Nobody* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Noble, Richard, *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge* (US: Folcroft Library Editions, 1976).
- Nora, Pierre, 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire', *Representations* 26 (1989), 7-25.
- Nowottny, Winifred, *The Language Poets Use* (London and New York: The Athlone Press, 1965).

- Nuttall, A. D., 'The Major Histories', in *Shakespeare the Thinker* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 133-70.
- O'Conner, John, 'Henry V', in *Shakespearean Afterlives: Ten Characters with a Life of their Own* (Cambridge: Icon Books, 2005), pp. 49-68.
- Palfrey, Simon, *Doing Shakespeare* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2005).
- , and Tiffany Stern, *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Palmer, John, *Political Characters of Shakespeare* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1945).
- Patterson, Annabel, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1994).
- Peters, Julie Stone, 'Theater and Book in the History of Memory: Materializing Mnemosyne in the Age of Print', *Modern Philology*, 102:2 (Nov., 2004), 179-206.
- Pilkington, Ace G., *Screening Shakespeare from Richard II to Henry V* (Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware Press; and London: Associated University Presses, 1991).
- Pocock, J. G. A., 'The Politics of History: The Subaltern and the Subversive', *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 6 (1998), 219-34.
- Potter, Lois, 'The Antic Disposition of Richard II', *Shakespeare Survey 27: Shakespeare's Early Tragedies* (1974), 33-41.
- , "'Nobody's Perfect": Actors' Memories and Shakespeare's Plays of the 1590s', *Shakespeare Survey 42: Shakespeare and the Elizabethans* (1989-90), 85-97.
- Proust, Marcel, *Remembrance of Things Past, Volume 1*, trans. C.K. Scott Moncrieff (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 2006).
- Pugliatti, Paola, *Shakespeare the Historian* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996).
- Quinones, Ricardo J., 'Time and Historical Values in the Literature of the Renaissance', in *Aspects of Time*, ed. C.A. Patrides (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976), pp. 38-56.
- Quinn, Michael, *Henry V* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1970).
- Quint, David, "'Alexander the Pig": Shakespeare on History and Poetry', *Boundary 2*, 10:3 (Spring, 1982), 49-67.
- Rabkin, Norman, *Shakespeare and the Problem of Meaning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).
- Rackin, Phyllis, 'The Role of the Audience in Shakespeare's *Richard II*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 36:3 (Autumn, 1985), 262-81.
- , *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca: NY: Cornell University Press, 1990).
- Raman, Shankar, 'Marking Time: Memory and Market in *The Comedy of Errors*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 56:2 (Summer, 2005), 176-205.
- Rancière, Jacques, *The Names of History: On the Poetics of Knowledge*, trans. Hassan Melechy (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 'The Dead King', pp. 10-23.
- Ribner, Irving, *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957).
- Ricoeur, Paul, 'Imagination, Testimony and Trust: A Dialogue with Paul Ricoeur', in *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*, ed. Richard Kearney and Mark Dooley (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 12-17.
- , *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

- Righter, Anne, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1962).
- Roach, Joseph, *Cities of the Dead* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).
- Rose, Mark, *Shakespearean Design* (Cambridge, MA.: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1972).
- Rossiter, A. P., *Woodstock: A Moral History* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1946).
- , 'Richard II', in *Angels with Horns*, ed. Graham Storey (NY: Theatre Arts Books, 1961), pp. 23-39.
- RSC (Royal Shakespeare Company), Press Release: 'RSC's *Henry V* to open on Anniversary of Battle of Agincourt and St Crispin's Day' (19 September 2007).
- Ruiter, David, *Shakespeare's Festive History: Feasting, Fasting and Lent in the Second Henriad* (Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2003).
- Rutter, David, 'Harry's (in)human face', in *Spiritual Shakespeares*, ed. Ewan Fernie (London and New York: Routledge, 2005).
- Ryan, Kiernan, 'The Future of History: 1 and 2 Henry IV', in *Shakespeare*, 3rd edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 38-66.
- , '"Here's fine revolution": Shakespeare's Philosophy of the Future', *Essays in Criticism*, 63:2 (April, 2013), 105-27.
- Saint Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. and intro. R. S. Pine Coffin (London: Penguin, 1961).
- Salinger, Leo, 'Memory in Shakespeare', *Cahiers élisabéthains*, 45 (1994), 59-64.
- Sanders, Norman, 'The True Prince and the False Thief: Prince Hal and the Shift of Identity', *Shakespeare Survey 30: Henry IV to Hamlet* (1977), 29-34.
- Scott Kastan, David, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time* (Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New Hampshire, 1982).
- Scoufos, Alice Lyle, 'The Martyrdom of Falstaff', *Shakespeare Studies*, 2 (1966), 174-91.
- Seltzer, Daniel, 'Prince Hal and the Tragic Style', *Shakespeare Survey 30: Henry IV to Hamlet* (1977), 13-27.
- Shaheen, Naseeb, *Biblical References in Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Associated Presses, 1989).
- Shapiro, I. A., 'Robert Fludd's Stage Illustration', *Shakespeare Studies*, 2 (1966), 192-209.
- Skura, Meredith, 'Marlowe's *Edward II*: Penetrating Language in Shakespeare's *Richard II*', *Shakespeare Survey 50: Shakespeare and Language* (1997), 41-56.
- Smith, Emma, *Shakespeare's Histories: A Guide to Criticism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).
- Somerset, J. A. B., 'Falstaff, the Prince, and the Pattern of 2 Henry IV', *Shakespeare Survey 30: Henry IV to Hamlet*, ed. Kenneth Muir (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 35-45.
- Sorabji, Richard, *Aristotle on Memory* (Rhode Island: Brown University Press, 1972).
- Spencer, Benjamin T., '2 Henry IV and the Theme of Time', *The University of Toronto Quarterly*, 13 (1944), 394-99.
- Spevack, Marvin, 'Beyond Individualism: Names and Namelessness in Shakespeare', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 56:1 (Autumn, 1993), 383-98.
- Spurgeon, Caroline F. E., *Shakespeare's Imagery and What it Tells us*, particularly 'Ch. XII: Leading Motives in the Histories' (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935), pp. 213-258.
- Stern, Tiffany, *Making Shakespeare: From Stage To Page* (London: Routledge, 2004).
- , *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Sternlicht, Sanford, 'Shakespeare's Use of the Memory of *Richard II* in 1 and 2 Henry IV

- and Henry V', *Ball State University Forum*, 12 (1971), 26-38.
- Strathern, Paul, *The Essential Nietzsche* (London: Virgin, 1996).
- Sullivan, Garrett A., *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Sutphen, Joyce Ann, *Shakespeare and the Art of Memory* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Minnesota, 1996).
- Suzman, Arthur, 'Imagery and Symbolism in *Richard II*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 7:4 (Autumn, 1956), 355-70.
- Sypher, Wylie, *The Ethic of Time: Structures of Experience in Shakespeare* (New York, Seabury Press, 1976).
- Tillyard, E. M. W., *The Elizabethan World Picture*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1943).
- , *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1974).
- Traversi, Derek, *Shakespeare: from Richard II to Henry V* (London: Hollis, 1957).
- Trevelayn, George Macaulay, *History of England* (London: Longmans, Todds, 1937).
- Trussler, Simon, *Will's Will: the Last Wishes of William Shakespeare* (Richmond: The National Archives, 2007).
- Turner, Frederick, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Time* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
- Velz, John W. (ed.), *Shakespeare's English Histories: A Quest for Form and Genre* (Binghamton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Text Studies, 1996).
- Vickers, Brian, *The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose* (London: Methuen, 1968).
- Ward, Michael J., *Shakespeare's Sense of History* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oregon, 1999).
- Warnock, Mary, *Memory* (London: Faber and Faber, 1989).
- Watt, R. J. C. (ed.), *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Longman, 2002).
- Weidhorn, Manfred, 'The Relation of Title and Name to Identity in Shakespearean Tragedy', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 9:2 (Spring, 1969), 303-19.
- Weingarten, Samuel, 'The Name of King in *Richard II*', *College English*, 27:7 (1996), 536-41.
- Weiss, Tanja, *Shakespeare on the Screen: Kenneth Branagh's Adaptations of Henry V, Much Ado About Nothing and Hamlet* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000).
- White, Hayden, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).
- , *Metahistory: The Historical Discourse* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973).
- , *Tropics of Discourse* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978).
- Wilder, Lina Perkins, 'Shakespeare and Memory', *Literature Compass*, 9/8 (2012), 549-59.
- , *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre: Recollection, Properties, and Character* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- Wilders, John, *The Lost Garden: A View of Shakespeare's English and Roman History Plays* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1978).
- Wood, Nigel, *Henry IV Parts I and II* (London: Open University Press, 1995).
- Woolf, D. R., *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Wright, George T., *Shakespeare's Metrical Art* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA., and London: University of California Press, 1988).
- Wright, Louis B., *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell

- University Press, 1953).
- Yates, Frances A., *The Art of Memory* (London: Pimlico, 1992).
- Zenón, Luis-Martínez, 'Shakespeare's Historical Drama as Trauerspiel: *Richard II* - And After', *ELH*, 75:3 (Fall, 2008), 673-96.
- Zitner, Sheldon P., 'Aumerle's Consiracy', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 14:2 (Spring, 1974), 239-2.

Websites

Concordance of Shakespeare's works
<<http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/concordance>> [accessed 30 July 2013].

The Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (Peer Reviewed)
<<http://www.iep.utm.edu/kierkega>> [accessed 30 July 2013].

Stanford University's Philosophy pages
<<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kierkegaard>> [accessed 30 July 2013].

APPENDIX A: THE MEMORY THEATRE OF GIULIO CAMILLO

Taken from Francis Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Pimlico, 1966).

The Memory Theatre
of Giulio Camillo
based on
L'Idèa del Theatro



